US Army Corps
of Engineers
Hydrologic Engineering Center

Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6

December 1984

Approved for Public Release. Distribution Unlimited.

TP-102

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Department of Defense, Executive Services and Communications Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.
PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
December 1984	Technical Paper	

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
D. Michael Gee

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5F. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
US Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC)
609 Second Street
Davis, CA 95616-4687

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
TP-102

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

10. SPONSOR/ MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/ MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES
Presented at the Second Bridge Engineering Conference, Sponsored by the Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Minneapolis, MN, 24-26 September 1984.

14. ABSTRACT

Calibration, the process of adjusting model parameters such that model results conform to observed prototype behavior is an essential ingredient of any modeling effort; be it physical or mathematical. Calibration strategies for movable boundary numerical modeling (i.e., HEC-6 "Scour and Deposition in Rivers and Reservoirs") vary widely depending upon type and availability of field data and study scope and objective. This paper describes the process of calibrating HEC-6, and interpretation of field data and model results. Examples drawn from past project studies are used to illustrate important points. The theoretical and numerical limitations on the extrapolation of model results beyond the calibration range are described. Sensitivity of model results to key input data and its applicability to bridge design are also discussed.

The future research and development program at the Hydrologic Engineering Center in the area of movable boundary mathematical modeling is presented.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
sediment transport, numerical models, calibration, river mechanics

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER
U	U	U	UU	28	

Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6

December 1984

US Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
Hydrologic Engineering Center
609 Second Street
Davis, CA 95616

(530) 756-1104
(530) 756-8250 FAX
www.hec.usace.army.mil

TP-102

Papers in this series have resulted from technical activities of the Hydrologic Engineering Center. Versions of some of these have been published in technical journals or in conference proceedings. The purpose of this series is to make the information available for use in the Center's training program and for distribution with the Corps of Engineers.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products.

Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6

by D. Michael Gee*

ABSTRACT

Calibration, the process of adjusting model parameters such that model results conform with observed prototype behavior is an essential ingredient of any modeling effort; be it physical or mathematical. Calibration strategies for movable boundary numerical modeling (i.e., HEC-6(6)) vary widely depending upon type and availability of field data and study scope and objective. This paper describes the process of calibrating HEC-6, and interpretation of field data and model results. Examples drawn from past project studies are used to illustrate important points. The theoretical and numerical limitations on the extrapolation of model results beyond the calibration range are described. Sensitivity of model results to key input data and its applicability to bridge design are also discussed.

The future research and development program at the Hydrologic Engineering Center in the area of movable boundary mathematical modeling is presented.

---

*Chief, Computer Support Center
The Hydrologic Engineering Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
609 Second Street, Davis, CA 95616

Presented at the Second Bridge Engineering Conference,
Sponsored by the Transportation Research Board,
National Research Council,
24-26 September 1984, Minneapolis, MN

INTRODUCTION

HEC-6 (6) is a one-dimensional movable boundary open channel flow model designed to simulate streambed profile changes over fairly long time periods (typically years). The continuous flow record is broken into a sequence of steady flows of variable duration. For each flow a backwater profile is calculated thereby providing energy slope, velocity, etc. at each cross section. Potential sediment transport rates are then computed at each section. These rates combined with the duration of the flow allow for a volumetric accounting of sediment for each reach. The amount of scour or deposition at each section is then computed and the cross-section shape adjusted accordingly. The computations proceed to the next flow in the sequence and the cycle is repeated beginning with the updated geometry. The sediment calculations are performed by grain size fraction thereby allowing for the simulation of hydraulic sorting and armoring. Many options and features are available such as: capability to include tributary and distributary flows, automatic channel dredging, gravel mining, graphical display of simulation results, etc. HEC-6 has been widely distributed and is frequently used within the Corps of Engineers, other government agencies, universities, and the private sector.

Experience has shown that successful application of movable boundary models quite often requires substantial effort to reproduce field observations, i.e., calibration. Consequently, this paper focuses on the process used and variables adjusted during the calibration phase of a study.

The key components of the calibration - verification process for HEC-6 applications that will be described below are:

1. Comprehend the historical behavior of the stream system.

2. Develop representative data.

   a. Geometric data.

   b. Sediment data.

   c. Hydrologic data.

3. Perform calibration.

   a. Select calibration measures.

      i. Changes in bed profile
      ii. Changes in cross section geometry.
      iii. Changes in volumes of sediment.
      iv. Rating curve shifts.
      v. Others as suits study level and objectives.

   b. Select calibration time period.

   c. Identify acceptable model performance.

   d. Adjust parameters.

4. Perform verification.

In the process of calibrating a complex fluvial hydraulics model such as HEC-6, it is important to distinguish between the following three types of data: (1) Run data - the specific input information required to operate the mathematical model, (2) calibration data - prototype measurements used to adjust various model parameters such that model results conform to the observed prototype behavior, and (3) verification data - an independent set of measurements, not used in calibration, that is used to test the validity of the calibrated model.

HISTORICAL BEHAVIOR OF THE STREAM SYSTEM

It is essential for the modeler to comprehend the historical behavior of the stream system early in the study. Development of appropriate representative data and assessment of the model's performance require such an understanding. Historical behavior refers to engineering time scale rather than geologic time scale. Contemporary engineering analyses address time frames ranging from single flood events to project life spans.

Selection of the study area requires certain considerations. The area should extend sufficiently far upstream from the problem area that alternatives being evaluated do not produce changes to the streambed profile or sediment load at the upstream boundary of the area being modeled. The study area should also include all major sediment producing tributaries. Usually the location of stream gaging stations will determine the limits of a study area. Hydraulic structures may also be used as a study boundary; they are most appropriate as a downstream boundary rather than an inflow boundary.

To ascertain the historical behavior of the stream system, assemble all information from office files: maps, surveyed cross sections, observed water surface profiles, aerial photographs, ground photographs, flow hydrographs, stage hydrographs, stage-discharge rating curves, water temperature records, suspended sediment loads, total sediment loads, gradation of the suspended and total loads, gradation of the streambed material; the location, date and size of all impoundments; the location, date and extent of all bridge contruction activities; location, date and extent of all construction activities adjacent to the stream channels; the location, date, amount and material gradation for each dredging activity in the study area; land use and soil types; and prior studies.

The availability of each type of data may be shown on a time line. This is particularly useful for flow data to determine a base period for calibration. Having organized and inventoried available data, begin a detailed study to accomplish each of the following tasks:

a. Establish a general knowledge about extreme events in the study area and how the system responded in terms of channel changes and amount of sediment transported;

b. Establish a general awareness of the response time of the stream system in terms of rate of movement of flood hydrographs, rate of response to changes in sediment load, etc.;

c. Evaluate the impact of recent impoundments on the water discharge hydrograph and the sediment load;

d. Establish a general understanding of the historical behavior of the stream system - the part of the behavior that would have occurred naturally and the part that may be attributed to man's activities in the study area (land use as well as stream use);

e. Locate anomalies in geometric, hydrologic, hydraulic and sediment characteristics within the study area;

f. Refine the study objectives, identify possible project alternatives and appropriate analytical approaches; and

g. Identify missing data which can be supplied only by additional field measurements or field reconnaissance.

It is important to view the study area with someone who is intimately familiar with it. Particularly, note all locations where scour or deposition occurred and the stream did not return to its original cross section or alignment. Locate and date each bridge crossing, each cut-off (natural or man-made), each encroachment, each levee, each diversion and/or each bifurcation. Note overbank areas which flood first and locate their natural levees.

The streambed and banks must be studied to locate rock outcroppings or other geologic formations which will resist scour and therefore control the vertical movement of the streambed. The grain size of sediment on the point bars should be observed and locations of abrupt changes noted. Of particular interest are locations where the gradual change from coarse to fine particles in the downstream direction is interrupted by a sudden change which persists in the downstream direction.

DEVELOPMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DATA

Specific input data requirements for the operation of HEC-6 are presented in the users manual (6). The quantity of data necessary to operate HEC-6 for long-term simulations can be quite large. Therefore, it is beneficial to have a systematic procedure for storing, manipulating, and displaying those data (5,9). This section addresses the problem of developing representative data. Representative data are not necessarily averages of many samples. For example, representative geometry preserves channel width, depth, and roughness and allows the numerical model to transport sediment with changes in bed elevation which match prototype observations. The representative inflowing sediment load preserves both volume of sediment and rate of sediment inflow at the upstream boundary of the study area. The representative bed material gradation and gradation of inflowing sediment load allow the model to transport observed sediment discharges while reproducing observed changes to the bed elevation. Representative water discharges include flow rate, and to a lesser extent, flow volume and amount of attenuation of flood hydrographs as they move down the system. Having flows match the appropriate flow-duration relationship is extremely important, (i.e., representative flows for the calibration period are those which occurred during that period, whereas representative flows for the study period are those producing the long-term flow duration curve). Beginning with geometric data, procedures for developing representative data are suggested. These are by no means all inclusive guidelines, but they stress the most important characteristics of the real physical system which should be preserved.

Geometric Data

Geometric data consist of cross sections, their locations, and boundary roughness (Manning's n values). Cross sections should be located at major changes in bed profile, at points where channel or valley width changes, at tributaries, and at all pertinent points where calculated results are required (e.g., stream gaging stations). The geometric model should extend sufficiently far upstream from bridge crossings so that it will be beyond any backwater effects. A portion of each cross section must be specified as "movable" (Fig. 1). This requires good engineering judgement and may require adjustment during calibration.

Avoid locating cross sections too close together. The shorter the distance between sections, the shorter the computation interval has to be in HEC-6. Short computation intervals require more computer time, and, therefore, should be avoided in long-period studies. This may prove particularly troublesome as the simulation of scour at a bridge location is a local phenomenon which implies use of a fine grid analysis. Short time steps (hours or less) may, therefore be necessary. It appears as though the resulting study should focus on a single event analysis rather than a multi-year trend analysis.

Error Checking Geometric Data

Movable streambed calculations are much more sensitive to errors in boundary geometry than are fixed-bed water surface profile calculations; consequently, more care is required to prepare geometry than is typical for fixed-bed water surface profile studies. A cross section which is too wide or too deep will show up as a point of deposition; one which is too narrow or shallow will exhibit a tendency to scour. Not only will that section be affected, but calculated results will be incorrect at sections upstream and downstream from it. Geometric data errors, therefore, are difficult to locate when HEC-6 is executing in the movable-bed mode; therefore, the first step in debugging and calibrating geometric data is to run the model in fixed-bed mode. This allows calibration of the geometric and hydraulic portions of the study separately from the sediment portions. This is a very critical first step because validity of subsequent sediment computations is dependent upon having an accurate hydraulic description of the system as well as representative sediment data.

Selection of n Values

Appropriate values for Manning's n should be determined by executing HEC-6 in the fixed-bed mode, i.e., as a step-backwater program. This is necessary to compare calculated water surface elevations with observed (or calculated profiles from a program such as HEC-2) water surface profiles or rating curves.

Careful consideration should be given to the selection of Manning's n values. Changing Manning's n values with distance should be justified based on changes in channel appearance or sediment size. Avoid changes where the only reason is to reconstitute an observed stage (14). Oftentimes, it is more logical to approximately reconstitute the stages at several gage locations over a long reach using a constant Manning's n value for a given discharge than it is to change Manning's n values at each gage in order to exactly match observed stages. Also, Manning's n values may vary with discharge, that is,



FIGURE 1
EXAMPLE CROSS SECTION

the bed form in alluvial rivers often changes during the passing of a flood event. As yet, it is not possible to accurately predict such changes (2,4,13). Until a theoretical basis is developed one should consider acknowledging such a change by associating Manning's n values with water discharge if field data for the particular river support such a variation.

Sediment Data

Preparation of accurate sediment data and development of a representative inflowing sediment load curve are essential. The overall objective in preparing sediment data for river studies is to establish the sediment load that accompanies river flows and determine the proper size distribution and character of the bed material. The most common approach is to plot observed water discharge versus observed sediment load as shown in Figure 2. These plots usually exhibit a log cycle of scatter. The representative load curve produces the proper annual volume of sediment when integrated with the water discharge hydrograph for the year in question. The total inflowing load, and distribution of grain sizes within that load, must be adjusted until a representative curve has been established.

Note that, for the purpose of simulating scour at bridge crossings, the fine materials (clays and silts) may be irrelevant. These materials are included in suspended load measurements, however, and may, therefore, have to be included in the model input data to reproduce the measured average annual total loads.

Once representative inflowing sediment load curves have been identified for all size classes, bed material gradation curves must be developed from field samples. See Figure 3 for an example. Figure 4 shows an example plot of profiles of grain size gradation versus river mile. Plots such as these assist the modeler in understanding the stream's behavior by illustrating grain size changes along the study reach, which reflect the influences of geologic controls, tributaries, etc.

Hydrologic Data

Hydrologic data consist of the following items:

a. Water discharges for the mainstem and for all local inflow or outflow points.

b. The stage hydrograph, rating curve, or operating rule giving water surface elevation at the downstream end of the model.

c. Temperatures for the inflowing water discharges (see (14) for explanation of importance).

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPUTATION INTERVALS

The computation interval (or time step) used by HEC-6 is usually variable; short time steps must be taken during flood events when large amounts of sediment are moving and the hydrograph is rapidly changing. Longer time steps are used during low flow periods (Figure 5). Generally the closer the cross sections, the smaller the required time step. The modeler is confronted with



FIGURE 2

Trinity River & Tributaries, Texas
SUSPENDED SEDIMENT
DISCHARGE RATING CURVE
NATURAL CONDITIONS
ROMAYOR GAGE



FIGURE 3

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF BED MATERIAL



FIGURE 4. EXAMPLE OF PROFILES OF BED SEDIMENT SIZE, BIG SANDY RIVER, HUNTINGTON DIST., C.E.



FIGURE 5. HYDROGRAPH FOR HEC-6

the dilemma of wanting to use small time steps for an accurate solution and large time steps for an economic solution. A procedure for selecting an "optimum" time step is outlined in (8). Presently, the HEC uses a data preprocessor that automatically develops a variable time step flow record from mean daily flows based upon an estimation of the volume of sediment entering the study reach each time step. For a multi-year simulation the time step typically ranges from one day to one month.

Operation of the model for a test period (say an "average" year) should be performed as a check on data consistency and reasonableness prior to attempting calibration runs. The flow record for an "average" year can be constructed from the flow duration relationship. Key items to check at this time are:

a. Silt and clay should not deposit in the channel under natural river conditions. Any cross section which exhibits a reduction in silt or clay load passing through that section should be carefully checked. The cross section may be too large or a false channel control may exist downstream.

b. The sand load should approach a steady value, approximately equal to the inflowing load, from section to section rather than an erratic variation. Cross sections used in HEC-6 are representative of reaches, therefore, some smoothing of field data may be required. Sections which have very little transport capacity should be checked for errors in cross section geometry, reach length, n values, limits of movable bed, or perhaps, bed material gradation.

If the model performance simulates the behavior that would be expected in the prototype in all respects, the computation interval along with the other several parameters have been determined. Otherwise, one must determine what is causing the questionable performance. For example, excessive fill may mean the limits of movable bed are too narrow or the natural levee is too low. If the prototype is depositing sediment above the overbank elevation, expand the movable-bed limits to include the overbank. If water is spilling onto the overbank in the computer model but that area is not effective for conveyance in the prototype, raise the natural levees. If excessive scour is indicated by the computed results, it may mean that the prototype has either an armored bottom or non-erosive or rocky bottom that is resistant to scour.

PREPARING FLOW RECORDS

The three main points to consider in developing flow records are:

a. Preserve the total volume of water in the observed hydrograph.

b. Preserve the total volume of sediment which was transported during the hydrograph period.

c. Make the computation intervals as long as possible and still preserve computational stability (7).

There is usually a strong correlation between the annual volume of water that passes a gage and the annual sediment yield of that basin. The rate of

sediment movement, called sediment load, is not a function of water volume. It is a function, however, of water discharge (Figure 2), and the availability of sediment material. In many cases, three-quarters of the annual sediment yield will be transported in less than one-quarter of the year. Therefore, it is necessary that all flow records contain the flood peaks.

CALIBRATION MEASURES

Selection of appropriate calibration measures for a movable boundary model such as HEC-6 is not straightforward. Ideally, one would have complete sets of surveyed cross sections and measured sediment transport rates periodically throughout the calibration period. Such data sets are extremely rare. Consequently, different calibration measures may be used for different studies depending on study objective, data availability, etc. (8). A useful calibration measure is the observed drift of the rating for a stream gage. This is a good measure because the rating curve integrates, to a certain extent, behavior of a stream reach rather than a single point or cross section. Care should be taken that the rating curve drift is being caused by scour or deposition and not roughness changes. The gage selected for use in calibration should not be within the influence of the downstream boundary. An example reproduction of a rating curve shift is shown on Figure 6.

Should cross-section surveys be available over an appropriate time interval, care must be taken to correctly compare model results and field data. Amounts of scour/deposition may not be exactly reproduced at specific cross-section locations. Regions of scour or deposition should correspond between model and prototype however. In some cases it is appropriate to compare volumes of scour/deposition as a calibration measure (3, 15).

Prior to using a numerical model such as HEC-6 for the analysis of projects, the model's performance needs to be evaluated. Evaluation normally consists of two phases of testing: calibration and verification. Calibration is intended to make computed results as accurate as possible. Measured or observed values from the prototype are compared with computed results to pinpoint input data deficiencies or physically unrealistic coefficient values. Model parameters are adjusted accordingly to improve the simulation. Calibration, however, does not mean the use of physically unrealistic parameters to force a poorly conceived model into satisfying prototype data. If there is a discrepancy between model results and calibration data then either there is something wrong in the physical realism of the model (a model deficiency as a result of limiting assumptions) or there is something wrong with the measured data or the interpretation of that data for model input (a data deficiency). Therefore, if calibration cannot be accomplished through the usage of physically realistic parameter values, the measured prototype data should be checked for possible errors and then the entire model (input data and limiting assumptions) should be examined, data coding checked, and boundary specifications examined. Experience has shown that the process of rectifying discrepancies between model results and prototype observations can substantially assist the engineer to understand the river's behavior. Once calibrated, a model needs to be verified by checking it's performance with a situation not used in the calibration.


RATING CURVES
ARKANSAS RIVER AT LA JUNTA, CO.
(GAGE # 07123000)
FIGURE 6
MEASURED
COMPUTED
⊙ HEC-6, INITIAL CONDITION
△ HEC-6, AFTER 29 YEARS (1951 - 1979)
5 FEB 69
13 APR 51
2 FEB 61
30 APR 82
WATER SURFACE ELEVATION IN FEET NGVD
(GAGE DATUM 4039.6 FT)
DISCHARGE IN CFS
4052
4050
4048
4046
4044
4042
4040
10
100
1000
10,000

SENSITIVITY OF SIMULATION RESULTS TO DATA UNCERTAINTIES

The sensitivity of simulated bed profile changes to various data can best be evaluated in light of the reliability of field measurements of those data. In addition to field data, there are various model parameters that cannot be measured directly and must be estimated by the model user and adjusted if necessary during the calibration process. Guidance on selection of model parameters is given in (8). A qualitative assessment, based on experience gained from many past applications of HEC-6, of the model sensitivity to variations in the various input data is presented in Table 1. Note that, in any particular study where uncertainty exists in the value of any particular input item, the model can be run for a range of values of that particular input item to assess the resultant variation in simulation results. This information can then be used to identify what, if any, additional field measurements are necessary to accomplish the study objectives.

Table 1

Sensitivity of Model Results to Field Data

Data Item	Field Measurement Reliability	Model Sensitivity	Remarks
1. Geometry			
Cross Sections	H	H	
Movable Bed Limits	L	H	Field Estimation & calibration
Roughness	M	M	Field Estimation & calibration
2. Sediment			
Bed Material Gradation	M	H	
Inflowing Load	L	H	H locally, M elsewhere
3. Hydrology			
Flow Record	H	M	Developing long-term flow records can be difficult; see (5)
Rating Curve	H	L	Local Effect
Temperature	H	L	

Notes: H=high, M=medium, L=low

APPLICATIONS TO BRIDGE DESIGN

Bridge-crossing design must confront both long-term river behavior (particularly as regards lateral migration) and single flood event response. Applications of HEC-6 to bridge crossing design would probably focus on the latter. This is a relatively new area of use of HEC-6 and many questions remain. Foremost is the stochastic nature of watershed sediment production. The behavior of any river reach is determined not only by local hydraulics, as perhaps modified by bridge construction, but also by the amount and size of sediment transported into the reach from upstream. The condition of the watershed at any particular time, e.g., recently burned, is not deterministic (11). Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain for a given hypothetical flood hydrograph, the appropriate inflowing load curve.

For single event bridge scour problems, it may be adequate to assume that the problem is governed by transport of bed material, neglecting wash load. Inflowing load can then be approximated based upon equilibrium transport in the reach several stream widths upstream of the bridge site (depending on flood hydrograph duration). HEC-6 applies to this problem providing that local scour phenomena are not coupled with multi-dimensional hydrodynamic phenomena in the vicinity of the bridge. For two-dimensional, near bridge problems RMA-2 (12) may be useful.

Another use of HEC-6 in bridge design is prediction of long-term trends in stream-bed profile behavior. Analysis can be made of the impacts of various scenarios regarding upstream and downstream actions (e.g., headcutting) at the bridge site. Note that, for either long-term or single-event studies, HEC-6 is best used to evaluate the relative impacts of different designs; e.g., design A vs. base condition, design A vs. design B, etc.

FUTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development program at the HEC in the area of movable boundary modeling consists of two integrated components. The first component consists of enhancements and improvements to HEC-6; the second, long-range component is the development and implementation of a second-generation movable-boundary model.

Several improvements to HEC-6 are underway at this time. The major items are development of a method of allowing the movable bed width to vary with the width of the water surface, i.e., water surface elevation. Presently, the scour or deposition at each cross section is applied to a fixed, user selected, portion of that cross section regardless of discharge. Incorporation of an algorithm to automatically identify which portion(s) of the cross section is submerged at each computational time step for scour/deposition calculation will provide a more physically realistic and less user-judgment-dependent solution.

One of the primary features that has contributed to the successful application of HEC-6 is the capability to route sediments by grain size fraction. Movement of one clay size, four silt sizes, and ten sizes of sands and gravels can be simulated. This provides the capability to simulate sorting and armoring of the bed material as the fines are transported much more rapidly than coarse materials. The algorithm that performs the

accounting calculations for all the grain sizes in the bed has evolved over the past ten years, incorporating the best available theories for the sorting and armoring processes. It has been noticed that a significant amount of computation effort is used by this particular algorithm. It is thought that significant gains in computational efficiency can be achieved by redesigning and simplifying this algorithm. Furthermore, the current algorithm requires the user to specify a (somewhat arbitrary) number of iterations within each computational time step for recalculation of the bed material gradation. A theoretical investigation has been undertaken to identify a better method of tracking the bed-material gradation using a physically based procedure for updating the bed-material gradation.

HEC-6 incorporates many of the capabilities and features necessary for a one-dimensional movable boundary river model. An important component not currently available is a method for tracking lateral migration of a river. It appears that viable theories are now becoming available for prediction of meander migration (1). Consideration is being given to incorporating this capability into the next generation movable-boundary model.

HEC-6 is a widely used model. It has been developed over the past ten years with features being added as required by various project studies. The level of effort necessary to support the model is becoming significant. HEC is considering, therefore, development of a "second-generation" movable boundary model that would employ the concepts of structured programming and algorithmic modularization. The purpose, use, theoretical basis, etc., would be similar to HEC-6. Some new capabilities, such as a lateral movement component, would be added, and obsolete or little used components discarded. The experience gained with the many applications of HEC-6 provides a valuable basis for the construction of a new model. Development of a new code will emphasize theoretical improvements, computational efficiency, structured programming, user ease, and interfaces with data management systems.

COMPUTATIONAL ASPECTS

Application of a movable-boundary model such as HEC-6 can require major computational resources, particularly for long-period studies (50-100 years). Operation of the simulation model is only one component of the computational requirements. It is also important to have software available for storage and manipulation of hydrologic data and graphical display of input data and simulation results. The linkage of the various software packages and data files developed for a recent study at the HEC is shown in Figure 7. This support software has become an integral and necessary component of any major movable-boundary modeling effort at the HEC. Single event analyses are less computationally intensive because the study reach is relatively short, the hydrographs are synthetic and of short duration, and the sediment loads can also be synthetically generated. Calibration data are rarely available for single-event analyses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The concepts presented regarding calibration of HEC-6 are those of William A. Thomas, original author of the model. The findings and opinions expressed herein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.



FIGURE 7

HEC-6 DATA FLOW AND PROGRAM LINKAGE

REFERENCES

1. American Society of Civil Engineers, "Rivers '83'. A Specialty Conference on River Meandering." New Orleans, Louisiana, 24-26 October 1983, Proceedings in press.

2. Barnes, H. H. Jr., "Roughness Characteristics of Natural Channels," U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1849, 1967.

3. Dyhouse, G. R., (1982) "Sediment Analysis for Urbanizing Watersheds," ASCE Journal of the Hydraulics Division, Vol. 108, No. HY3, March 1982.

4. Einstein, H. A., and Barbarossa, N. L., "River Channel Roughness," Transactions, American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 117, paper 2528, 1952, pp 1121-1146.

5. Gee, D. Michael, (1983) "Prediction of the Effects of a Flood Control Project on a Meandering Stream," ASCE Rivers '83.

6. The Hydrologic Engineering Center (1977a), HEC-6 Scour and Deposition in Rivers and Reservoirs, "Users Manual," U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, California.

7. _____ (1977b), Sediment Transport, "IHD Volume 12," U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, California.

8. _____ (1981), Guidelines for the Calibration and Application of HEC-6," Training Document No. 13.

9. _____ (1982), "The Hydrologic Engineering Center - Data Storage System (HEC-DSS) - An Overview."

10. _____ (1983), "Hydraulic Graphics Package." Users Manual.

11. MacArthur, Robert C. (1983) "Evaluation of the Effects of Fire on Sediment Delivery Rates In a Southern California Watershed," in Proceedings of the D. B. Simons Symposium On Erosion and Sedimentation, Fort Collins, Colorado.

12. Norton, W. R., and King, I. P., "User's Guide and Operating Instructions for the Computer Program RMA-2," report to The Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Resource Management Associates, Dec. 1976.

13. Simons, D. B., and Richardson, E. V., "Resistance to Flow in Alluvial Channels," U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 422J, 1966.

14. Vanoni, Vito A., editor, (1975), Sedimentation Engineering, ASCE Manuals and Reports on Engineering Practice, No. 54.

15. Williams, D. T., (1977), "Effects of Dam Removal: An Approach to Sedimentation", The Hydrologic Engineering Center, Technical Paper No. 50, Oct. 1977.

Technical Paper Series

TP-1 Use of Interrelated Records to Simulate Streamflow
TP-2 Optimization Techniques for Hydrologic Engineering
TP-3 Methods of Determination of Safe Yield and Compensation Water from Storage Reservoirs
TP-4 Functional Evaluation of a Water Resources System
TP-5 Streamflow Synthesis for Ungaged Rivers
TP-6 Simulation of Daily Streamflow
TP-7 Pilot Study for Storage Requirements for Low Flow Augmentation
TP-8 Worth of Streamflow Data for Project Design - A Pilot Study
TP-9 Economic Evaluation of Reservoir System Accomplishments
TP-10 Hydrologic Simulation in Water-Yield Analysis
TP-11 Survey of Programs for Water Surface Profiles
TP-12 Hypothetical Flood Computation for a Stream System
TP-13 Maximum Utilization of Scarce Data in Hydrologic Design
TP-14 Techniques for Evaluating Long-Tem Reservoir Yields
TP-15 Hydrostatistics - Principles of Application
TP-16 A Hydrologic Water Resource System Modeling Techniques
TP-17 Hydrologic Engineering Techniques for Regional Water Resources Planning
TP-18 Estimating Monthly Streamflows Within a Region
TP-19 Suspended Sediment Discharge in Streams
TP-20 Computer Determination of Flow Through Bridges
TP-21 An Approach to Reservoir Temperature Analysis
TP-22 A Finite Difference Methods of Analyzing Liquid Flow in Variably Saturated Porous Media
TP-23 Uses of Simulation in River Basin Planning
TP-24 Hydroelectric Power Analysis in Reservoir Systems
TP-25 Status of Water Resource System Analysis
TP-26 System Relationships for Panama Canal Water Supply
TP-27 System Analysis of the Panama Canal Water Supply
TP-28 Digital Simulation of an Existing Water Resources System
TP-29 Computer Application in Continuing Education
TP-30 Drought Severity and Water Supply Dependability
TP-31 Development of System Operation Rules for an Existing System by Simulation
TP-32 Alternative Approaches to Water Resources System Simulation
TP-33 System Simulation of Integrated Use of Hydroelectric and Thermal Power Generation
TP-34 Optimizing flood Control Allocation for a Multipurpose Reservoir
TP-35 Computer Models for Rainfall-Runoff and River Hydraulic Analysis
TP-36 Evaluation of Drought Effects at Lake Atitlan
TP-37 Downstream Effects of the Levee Overtopping at Wilkes-Barre, PA, During Tropical Storm Agnes
TP-38 Water Quality Evaluation of Aquatic Systems
TP-39 A Method for Analyzing Effects of Dam Failures in Design Studies
TP-40 Storm Drainage and Urban Region Flood Control Planning
TP-41 HEC-5C, A Simulation Model for System Formulation and Evaluation
TP-42 Optimal Sizing of Urban Flood Control Systems
TP-43 Hydrologic and Economic Simulation of Flood Control Aspects of Water Resources Systems
TP-44 Sizing Flood Control Reservoir Systems by System Analysis
TP-45 Techniques for Real-Time Operation of Flood Control Reservoirs in the Merrimack River Basin
TP-46 Spatial Data Analysis of Nonstructural Measures
TP-47 Comprehensive Flood Plain Studies Using Spatial Data Management Techniques
TP-48 Direct Runoff Hydrograph Parameters Versus Urbanization
TP-49 Experience of HEC in Disseminating Information on Hydrological Models
TP-50 Effects of Dam Removal: An Approach to Sedimentation
TP-51 Design of Flood Control Improvements by Systems Analysis: A Case Study
TP-52 Potential Use of Digital Computer Ground Water Models
TP-53 Development of Generalized Free Surface Flow Models Using Finite Element Techniques
TP-54 Adjustment of Peak Discharge Rates for Urbanization
TP-55 The Development and Servicing of Spatial Data Management Techniques in the Corps of Engineers
TP-56 Experiences of the Hydrologic Engineering Center in Maintaining Widely Used Hydrologic and Water Resource Computer Models
TP-57 Flood Damage Assessments Using Spatial Data Management Techniques
TP-58 A Model for Evaluating Runoff-Quality in Metropolitan Master Planning
TP-59 Testing of Several Runoff Models on an Urban Watershed
TP-60 Operational Simulation of a Reservoir System with Pumped Storage
TP-61 Technical Factors in Small Hydropower Planning
TP-62 Flood Hydrograph and Peak Flow Frequency Analysis
TP-63 HEC Contribution to Reservoir System Operation
TP-64 Determining Peak-Discharge Frequencies in an Urbanizing Watershed: A Case Study
TP-65 Feasibility Analysis in Small Hydropower Planning
TP-66 Reservoir Storage Determination by Computer Simulation of Flood Control and Conservation Systems
TP-67 Hydrologic Land Use Classification Using LANDSAT
TP-68 Interactive Nonstructural Flood-Control Planning
TP-69 Critical Water Surface by Minimum Specific Energy Using the Parabolic Method

TP-70 Corps of Engineers Experience with Automatic Calibration of a Precipitation-Runoff Model
TP-71 Determination of Land Use from Satellite Imagery for Input to Hydrologic Models
TP-72 Application of the Finite Element Method to Vertically Stratified Hydrodynamic Flow and Water Quality
TP-73 Flood Mitigation Planning Using HEC-SAM
TP-74 Hydrographs by Single Linear Reservoir Model
TP-75 HEC Activities in Reservoir Analysis
TP-76 Institutional Support of Water Resource Models
TP-77 Investigation of Soil Conservation Service Urban Hydrology Techniques
TP-78 Potential for Increasing the Output of Existing Hydroelectric Plants
TP-79 Potential Energy and Capacity Gains from Flood Control Storage Reallocation at Existing U.S. Hydropower Reservoirs
TP-80 Use of Non-Sequential Techniques in the Analysis of Power Potential at Storage Projects
TP-81 Data Management Systems of Water Resources Planning
TP-82 The New HEC-1 Flood Hydrograph Package
TP-83 River and Reservoir Systems Water Quality Modeling Capability
TP-84 Generalized Real-Time Flood Control System Model
TP-85 Operation Policy Analysis: Sam Rayburn Reservoir
TP-86 Training the Practitioner: The Hydrologic Engineering Center Program
TP-87 Documentation Needs for Water Resources Models
TP-88 Reservoir System Regulation for Water Quality Control
TP-89 A Software System to Aid in Making Real-Time Water Control Decisions
TP-90 Calibration, Verification and Application of a Two-Dimensional Flow Model
TP-91 HEC Software Development and Support
TP-92 Hydrologic Engineering Center Planning Models
TP-93 Flood Routing Through a Flat, Complex Flood Plain Using a One-Dimensional Unsteady Flow Computer Program
TP-94 Dredged-Material Disposal Management Model
TP-95 Infiltration and Soil Moisture Redistribution in HEC-1
TP-96 The Hydrologic Engineering Center Experience in Nonstructural Planning
TP-97 Prediction of the Effects of a Flood Control Project on a Meandering Stream
TP-98 Evolution in Computer Programs Causes Evolution in Training Needs: The Hydrologic Engineering Center Experience
TP-99 Reservoir System Analysis for Water Quality
TP-100 Probable Maximum Flood Estimation - Eastern United States
TP-101 Use of Computer Program HEC-5 for Water Supply Analysis
TP-102 Role of Calibration in the Application of HEC-6
TP-103 Engineering and Economic Considerations in Formulating
TP-104 Modeling Water Resources Systems for Water Quality
TP-105 Use of a Two-Dimensional Flow Model to Quantify Aquatic Habitat
TP-106 Flood-Runoff Forecasting with HEC-1F
TP-107 Dredged-Material Disposal System Capacity Expansion
TP-108 Role of Small Computers in Two-Dimensional Flow Modeling
TP-109 One-Dimensional Model for Mud Flows
TP-110 Subdivision Froude Number
TP-111 HEC-5Q: System Water Quality Modeling
TP-112 New Developments in HEC Programs for Flood Control
TP-113 Modeling and Managing Water Resource Systems for Water Quality
TP-114 Accuracy of Computer Water Surface Profiles - Executive Summary
TP-115 Application of Spatial-Data Management Techniques in Corps Planning
TP-116 The HEC's Activities in Watershed Modeling
TP-117 HEC-1 and HEC-2 Applications on the Microcomputer
TP-118 Real-Time Snow Simulation Model for the Monongahela River Basin
TP-119 Multi-Purpose, Multi-Reservoir Simulation on a PC
TP-120 Technology Transfer of Corps' Hydrologic Models
TP-121 Development, Calibration and Application of Runoff Forecasting Models for the Allegheny River Basin
TP-122 The Estimation of Rainfall for Flood Forecasting Using Radar and Rain Gage Data
TP-123 Developing and Managing a Comprehensive Reservoir Analysis Model
TP-124 Review of U.S. Army corps of Engineering Involvement With Alluvial Fan Flooding Problems
TP-125 An Integrated Software Package for Flood Damage Analysis
TP-126 The Value and Depreciation of Existing Facilities: The Case of Reservoirs
TP-127 Floodplain-Management Plan Enumeration
TP-128 Two-Dimensional Floodplain Modeling
TP-129 Status and New Capabilities of Computer Program HEC-6: "Scour and Deposition in Rivers and Reservoirs"
TP-130 Estimating Sediment Delivery and Yield on Alluvial Fans
TP-131 Hydrologic Aspects of Flood Warning - Preparedness Programs
TP-132 Twenty-five Years of Developing, Distributing, and Supporting Hydrologic Engineering Computer Programs
TP-133 Predicting Deposition Patterns in Small Basins
TP-134 Annual Extreme Lake Elevations by Total Probability Theorem
TP-135 A Muskingum-Cunge Channel Flow Routing Method for Drainage Networks
TP-136 Prescriptive Reservoir System Analysis Model - Missouri River System Application
TP-137 A Generalized Simulation Model for Reservoir System Analysis
TP-138 The HEC NexGen Software Development Project
TP-139 Issues for Applications Developers
TP-140 HEC-2 Water Surface Profiles Program
TP-141 HEC Models for Urban Hydrologic Analysis

TP-142 Systems Analysis Applications at the Hydrologic Engineering Center
TP-143 Runoff Prediction Uncertainty for Ungauged Agricultural Watersheds
TP-144 Review of GIS Applications in Hydrologic Modeling
TP-145 Application of Rainfall-Runoff Simulation for Flood Forecasting
TP-146 Application of the HEC Prescriptive Reservoir Model in the Columbia River Systems
TP-147 HEC River Analysis System (HEC-RAS)
TP-148 HEC-6: Reservoir Sediment Control Applications
TP-149 The Hydrologic Modeling System (HEC-HMS): Design and Development Issues
TP-150 The HEC Hydrologic Modeling System
TP-151 Bridge Hydraulic Analysis with HEC-RAS
TP-152 Use of Land Surface Erosion Techniques with Stream Channel Sediment Models
TP-153 Risk-Based Analysis for Corps Flood Project Studies - A Status Report
TP-154 Modeling Water-Resource Systems for Water Quality Management
TP-155 Runoff simulation Using Radar Rainfall Data
TP-156 Status of HEC Next Generation Software Development
TP-157 Unsteady Flow Model for Forecasting Missouri and Mississippi Rivers
TP-158 Corps Water Management System (CWMS)
TP-159 Some History and Hydrology of the Panama Canal
TP-160 Application of Risk-Based Analysis to Planning Reservoir and Levee Flood Damage Reduction Systems
TP-161 Corps Water Management System - Capabilities and Implementation Status