



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/169398/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Sanvitale, N., Bowman, E. and Cabrera, M.A. (2021) Experimental investigation on the impact dynamics of saturated granular flows on rigid barriers. *Environmental and Engineering Geoscience*, 27 (1). pp. 127-138. ISSN: 1078-7275

<https://doi.org/10.2113/EEG-D-20-00033>

© 2021 Association of Environmental and Engineering Geologists. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *Environmental and Engineering Geoscience*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Experimental investigation on the impact dynamics of saturated granular flows on rigid barriers

Nicoletta Sanvitale^{a,*}, Elisabeth Bowman^a, Miguel Angel Cabrera^b

^aUniversity of Sheffield, Sir Frederick Mappin Building, Mappin St., Sheffield, S1 3JD, UK

^bUniversidad de los Andes, Carrera 1 Este No. 19^a-40, Bogotá, 111711, Colombia



Abstract

Debris flows involve the high speed downslope motion of rocks, soil and water. Their high flow velocity, and high potential for impact loading make them one of the most hazardous of gravitational mass flows. This paper focuses on the role of particle size grading and degree of fluid saturation on impact behaviour of fluid saturated granular flows on a model rigid barrier in a small scale flume. The use of a transparent debris-flow model and Plane Laser Induced Fluorescence allows the motion of particles and fluid within the medium to be examined and tracked using image processing. In this paper, experiments are conducted of flows consisting of two uniform and one well graded particle size gradings at three different fluid contents. The evolution of the velocity profiles, impact load, bed normal pressure and fluid pore pressure for the different flows are measured and analysed in order to gain a quantitative comparison of their behaviour before, during and after impact.

21 **1. Introduction**

22 A debris flow is a rapid surging mass of non-plastic soil, rock and water in a steep channel that
23 may present high impact load and long runout (Iverson, 1997; Takahashi, 2007; Hungr et al., 2013). A
24 common approach to prevent these flows from reaching vulnerable areas is by obstructing their
25 channelized paths with engineered barriers, which trap most of the transported debris, dampening the
26 overall flow inertia, and, therefore, decreasing their expected runout. These barriers can be rigid walls
27 or flexible nets, with their main goal being to withstand the impact forces from the transported debris
28 and suspended (fluidized) material. Rigid barriers, also called check dams or sometimes catching dams,
29 are the most common mitigation structure against debris flows, due to the minimal technical skills
30 required in their construction and relative ease of obtaining building materials for reinforced concrete
31 (Hübl et al., 2009).

32 The mechanics of debris flows depends on the interactions between the solid and fluid phase,
33 which involves frictional, collisional and viscous stress transfer between particles and fluid, as well as
34 flow-bed interactions for both particles and fluid. While the estimation of the pressures generated by the
35 impact of debris flows on civil engineering structures has been widely investigated (Moriguci et al.,
36 2009, Armanini et al., 2011; Bugnion et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2011; Scheidl et al, 2012; Cui et al., 2015;
37 Zhou et al., 2018), the state of knowledge is still insufficient to accurately understand the effect of solid-
38 fluid interactions on the dynamics and load evolution of the impact process. As a result, design
39 approaches tend to be semi-empirical (Armanini 1997; Van Dine, 1996; Zhang, 1993; Arattano and
40 Franzi, 1993).

41 The current paper presents the results of experiments using transparent analogue debris flows in
42 a small-scale flume, aimed at investigating the bulk impact forces on rigid barriers. Granular flows with
43 different particle size distributions and fluid content are adopted for the tests. The dynamics of the impact

44 against a rigid barrier normal to the flow direction is observed via Planar Laser Induced Fluorescence,
45 PLIF (Sthor et al., 2003; Sanvitale & Bowman, 2012). Impact forces against the obstacle, the basal total
46 and fluid pressures, flow height and the mid cross-sectional flow dynamics at impact are recorded and
47 discussed.

48 **2. Experimental set up**

49 Before testing, the fluid saturated granular material is stored in a rectangular sealed tank at the
50 top of the channel. The material is gently agitated by hand within the tank to ensure consolidation is
51 avoided, prior to manually releasing a sluice gate. The material flows down the 2.57 m long and 150 mm
52 wide rectangular flume, whose angle of inclination can be adjusted, and which is set at 20° for the tests
53 described here (see Figure 1). The barrier model is made of a 10 mm thick, 145 mm wide and 190 mm
54 tall PMMA (acrylic) plate mounted perpendicularly to the base (see inset in Figure 1). This enables the
55 barrier to effectively cross the full width of the flume but be unaffected by wall interactions. The plate
56 is centrally connected via an aluminum support at the base to an axial load cell (U9C, HBM) and fixed
57 to a linear bearing (LZMHS12-37T2P1, SKF). The barrier model is fixed to the flume bed at 2.25 m
58 from the gate release. The sidewalls of the channel are made of borosilicate glass and the bottom of the
59 flume is roughened with 3D-printed PLA (polylactic acid) plates with a hexagonal packing of 3 mm
60 semi-spheres. The roughened bed is instrumented along its base with three pore pressure transducers,
61 denoted PPT2, 3 and 4 (PDCR 810 Druck) and a load cell (LUX-B-ID Kyowa) with a top circular sensing
62 plate of 23 mm diameter. PPT2 is located 350mm upslope from the end of the flume. Pore pressure
63 sensor PPT2 and the load cell are located closest to the barrier at 75 mm distance from it and 30 mm
64 either side of the centerline. The transducers PPT3 and PPT4 are located 175 mm and 350 mm further
65 upslope from PPT2, respectively. All basal sensors have 3D printed disk headings, equivalent to the
66 roughness of the rest of the base with the top of the heading flush with the base.

67 A 0.5 mm thick 532 nm laser light sheet is allowed to pass through a slit cut in the roughened
68 bed and barrier model base, illuminating the flowing material along the flume centerline. The laser used
69 is an Opus Quantum 532 producing continuous illumination at a power of approximately 1.5 W. The
70 laser beam is positioned perpendicular to the bottom of the flume via a mirror then sent through three
71 uncoated plano-convex cylindrical lenses (purchased from www.thorlabs.com) that spreads the beam
72 into a light sheet. The length of the illuminated flume section is approximately 130-150mm. A high-
73 speed camera (Miro M310) located close to the end of the flume records video of the illuminated cross-
74 section at 2000 frames per second with a resolution of 1280 x 800 pixels. A long pass filter is placed
75 over the lens to transmit only the fluorescence signal and discard the reflected laser light (Sanvitale and
76 Bowman, 2012).

77 *2.1. Materials*

78 The PLIF technique relies on the use of a laser sheet to excite the fluorescence of a dye diluted
79 in the fluid, and hence create an illuminated plane within the flow in which particles appear as dark
80 shapes against a bright background. For the PLIF technique to work under optimum conditions, the
81 refractive indices of the fluid and solid should match. The current experiments are performed with
82 hydrocarbon oil (Cargille laboratories) dyed with a fluorescent powder, Nile Red, and mixed with
83 borosilicate glass beads (Sigmund Lindner GmbH). The fluid has a kinematic viscosity that is 16 times
84 higher than water (16 cSt at 25 °C) and a density that is 1.182 times lower (0.846 g/cm^3), such that
85 mixture consolidation behavior is equivalent to that using quartz particles that one quarter the diameter
86 in water. See Sanvitale & Bowman (2012) for further details on the experimental technique.

87 Three granular materials consisting of spherical borosilicate glass beads are used in these
88 experiments: two uniform particle size distributions, PSD1 and PSD2, with glass beads of 3 mm and 7.5
89 mm respectively, and a more well graded sample, PSD3 (coefficient of uniformity $C_U = d_{60}/d_{10} = 5$,

90 where d_x denotes the percentage passing by mass), with mean particle size of 7.5 mm (Figure 2). These
91 samples are intended to provide an insight on the effects of particle size and gradation on the impact
92 dynamics. The influence on the flow dynamics and impact of the fluid content are also investigated by
93 setting the initial fluid content f_c , defined as $\text{mass}_{\text{fluid}}/\text{mass}_{\text{solid}}$ to 24%, 28% and 32%, for each solid
94 material investigated (equivalent to solid volume fractions of 0.61, 0.58 and 0.54, respectively). Hence,
95 we report the results of nine experiments in all.

96

97 *2.2. Test procedure*

98 Prior to each experiment, the flume is cleaned, avoiding the presence of dirt and oil films on the
99 roughened bed and sidewalls. For each experiment exactly 10 kg of solid mass is used (Table 1). Oil to
100 the desired fluid content is poured into the container and gently mixed with the glass beads to reduce the
101 entrainment of air bubbles that would otherwise reduce optical transparency. Agitation of the mixture is
102 maintained while the laser beam is set on, the high-speed camera is activated, and the sluice gate is
103 opened. At release, a triggering shutter connected to the gate activates the sensors that record at a
104 sampling rate of 36 kHz, for a duration of 9 s. Low pass filters are applied to the outcomes as described
105 in Section 3.2.

106 **3. Results and discussion**

107 *3.1. Impact kinematics*

108 Figure 3 shows images of the flow impact for each PSD at different fluid content, f_c 24% for
109 PSD1 and PSD2 and f_c 32% for PSD3 (images for the other tests are not shown for brevity). The flow
110 direction is from right to left. The images show different instants during the impact of the mixture against

111 the barrier with respect to the time $t=0$ at which the sluice gate was opened. For all the tests the impact
112 process is characterized by a first stage during which individual saltating particles impact the wall before
113 the arrival of the flow front. For the test using PSD3, due to the segregation of the different particle sizes
114 during downslope shearing (Sanvitale and Bowman, 2012; 2017), larger particles accumulate at the
115 front.

116 The images show the three different impact mechanisms (Armanini et al., 2011; Choi et al., 2015;
117 Gray et al., 2003; Faug et al., 2015; Albaba et al., 2018) observed during experiments. The first
118 mechanism (Fig 3(a)) is displayed only by PSD1 (uniform grain size of 3 mm beads) at f_c 24% and
119 consists of a type of pile up process. The surge front impacts the rigid barrier and deposits at the base,
120 then the subsequent flow material impacts and piles up on top of the existing deposits. When the
121 maximum pileup height is reached the impact process rapidly attenuates. The second mechanism (Fig
122 3(b)) is characterized after the impact by the formation of a reflected wave propagating upstream. The
123 third mechanism (Fig 3(c)) consists of the formation of a vertical jet travelling parallel to the vertical
124 barrier that subsequently falls backward on the incoming surge, creating a secondary surge that
125 propagates upstream.

126 For PSD2 and PSD3 at f_c 24% we observe the formation of a reflected wave, while at f_c 28% and
127 32%, we observed the jet like behavior. The test for PSD1 at f_c 28% shows an intermediate behavior
128 with a formation of an initially small jet that, once it falls back on itself, creates a small surge propagating
129 upstream that is immediately stopped by the incoming flow. Subsequently the impact of the incoming
130 flow transitions more to be a type of reflected wave.

131 Figure 3 also shows the results of the corresponding Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) analyses
132 (Thielicke et al., 2014; Thielicke, 2014) conducted via image processing at specific stages on flow

133 impact. The velocity field shown via the quiver plots (quiver lengths proportional to speed) displays the
134 kinematics that are characteristic of the observed mechanisms.

135 The velocity v_i , which is the average speed of the front of the incoming surge approaching the
136 barrier before impact, is listed in Table 2. The front velocity is generally higher at larger fluid content.
137 For the uniform gradings, at the same fluid content, the velocities are higher for a larger particle size,
138 i.e. for PSD2 than PSD1. For the well-graded material, PSD3, with the same mean particle size as PSD2,
139 the front velocity is much lower, but it is higher than for PSD1 tests. The bed roughness may play a role
140 in the observed flow kinematics (Ahmadipur et al. 2019; Goujon et al., 2003; Silbert et al., 2001) with
141 the scale of roughness of the 3 mm semi-spheres on the base inducing greater shearing within the uniform
142 mixture of 3 mm beads in PSD1 compared to the 7.5 mm beads in PSD2. Tests with mixture PSD3
143 having 50% (by mass) particles larger than 7.5 mm and 50% smaller, produce lower flow velocities than
144 for PSD2. In these tests, the presence of finer particles may have a dampening effect on large particle
145 collisions, hence dissipate more energy within the body.

146 The Froude number, Fr:

147

148
$$Fr = \frac{v_i}{\sqrt{g \cos \theta} h_i} \quad (1)$$

149 where h_i is the flow depth of the incident surge, and θ the slope of the channel, quantifies the ratio
150 between the inertial and gravitational forces. Table 2 reports the Froude numbers calculated for the
151 experiments. The Fr results lie in the range between 0.90 and 4.86 – with values lying closer together
152 for the larger particle sizes. In all cases, Fr increases with fluid content, due both to increased velocity
153 and reduced flow height.

154 Armanini et al. (2011 and 2019) found that the nature of the impact depends on the Froude
155 number of the incoming front; when gravity dominates over inertia there is a formation of a reflected

156 wave, whereas when inertia dominates, jet-like behaviour up the wall occurs upon impact. Specifically,
157 Armanini et al. (2019) analyzed the dynamic impact of water and mixtures of water and sediments of a
158 specific PSD ($d_{30} = 2.0$ mm, $d_{50} = 3.5$ mm, $d_{90} = 9.0$ mm) on a barrier wall normal to flow. They found
159 that for $Fr < \sim 3$, a reflected wave forms, otherwise a vertical jet is produced. This finding is not in
160 complete agreement with our results (Table 2), especially for the mixture PSD2, for which we observed
161 a reflected wave impact at f_c of 24%, corresponding to $Fr > 3$. The transition from reflected wave to jet-
162 behaviour lies in the Fr 3 to 4 zone but is influenced also by particle distribution and fluid content.

163 Figure 4 shows the evolution of the flow height at the barrier measured on the video footages
164 (note the truncation of the plotted height for heights greater than the wall). PSD2 exhibits the greatest
165 height at the barrier at the end of the test, which explains the greater final static load compared to the
166 other mixtures. PSD2 at f_c 28% and 32% are able to overtop the barrier.

167 Overtopping also occurs for PSD3 at f_c 32% in the final part of the event due to the large fluid
168 content, well above that needed to fully saturate (i.e. fill the voids between particles) the mixture, so that
169 it can flow easily towards the barrier, increasing the height of the free surface of the fluid at values higher
170 than the top of the wall.

171 The PSD3 at f_c 28% test displays a initial height peak at 0.28 s, which is due to the vertical jet
172 travelling up the wall at the beginning of the impact. After that a second spike follows at $t = 1.1$ s, due
173 to the accumulation of fluid behind the barrier at the end of the impact, as occurred for the test PSD3 at
174 f_c 32%. This excess of fluid after reaching the barrier is reflected and move upslope.

175 The height of PSD1 tests is always lower than barrier and reaches values at the end of the tests
176 comparable with PSD3.

177 3.2. Barrier load

178 The recorded raw barrier load signals present high frequency spikes that are due to random effects
179 depending on the resonance frequency of the load cell and on the single instantaneous impact of large
180 particles. In order to filter the data, we followed the procedure proposed by Scheidl et al. (2012), applying
181 a low pass filter with a maximum high frequency. This high frequency is estimated considering the
182 average maximum front velocity v_i , from the PIV analysis, and the maximum particle diameter, as $f_i = v_f$
183 / d_{\max} . For PSD3 d_{\max} has been take as $d_{90} = 20\text{mm}$. The resulting low pass filters for each test are listed
184 in Table 1.

185 Time histories for measured basal pressures and barrier loads for all tests are given in Figures 5
186 (fluid content f_c 24%), Figure 6 (f_c 28%) and Figure 7 (f_c 32%). In each case, the load on the barrier is
187 characterized by an initial dynamic phase and a subsequent final static value. The dynamic phase is due
188 to the impact loading exerted by the incoming flow against the barrier while the static value is given by
189 the pressure exerted by the deposited material behind the wall at the end of the event.

190 The tests with f_c 24% for all particle size distributions exhibit a gradual increase of the barrier
191 load due to the continuous accumulation of the material behind the barrier. The PSD2 and PSD3 tests
192 show many spikes in the signal related to the instantaneous impacts of single large beads. The highest
193 peak force is reached by the PSD2 tests because for these mixtures, more material is able to reach the
194 barrier, increasing the height of the static deposit (Figure 4). The high mobility of these flows is
195 confirmed by their front velocities that are highest for all fluid contents (Table 1). Furthermore, it has
196 to be noted that for the same mass of dry particles the fluid necessary to saturate the sample is different
197 for the three PSDs. Before testing we measured that the saturation of the sample in the tank is reached
198 with 22%, 20% and 13% of fluid content for the 3mm, 7.5mm and the well graded mixture, respectively.
199 Hence the fluid content in excess of saturation that is available to fluidize the mixture is potentially

200 higher for larger bead size (note that this picture becomes less clear for the well graded material, PSD3,
201 due to segregation as the flow develops).

202 The tests at f_c 28% exhibit larger Froude numbers (2.3, 3.9, and 3.3 for PSD1, 2 and 3,
203 respectively) and the observed impact mechanism consists of the formation of a vertical jet for PSD2
204 and PSD3. In these tests, during their dynamic interaction with the barrier, the flows develop a spike on
205 the barrier load curve corresponding to the instant at which the jet falls back on the free surface of the
206 incoming flow (Figure 6). This peak is followed by a transient decrease of the load due to the energy
207 dissipation caused by the hydraulic jump subsequent to the falling jet breaking on the flow surface. For
208 the PSD2 test, this spike represents the highest force, being larger than the final static load. For the PSD3
209 test before the impulse due to the falling jet, the barrier experiences a series of load peaks due to the
210 largest particles accumulating at the front (due to particle size segregation) and colliding with the wall,
211 although these transient peaks are lower than the final static load exerted on the wall by the total material
212 accumulated during the event.

213 Intermediate to this, for the PSD1 at f_c 28%, the flow impact produces an initial small jet that
214 gives rise to the formation of a surge propagating upstream. This is then stopped by the incoming flow
215 to evolve into a type of reflected wave.

216 The tests at f_c 32% for all the PSDs show that the impact mechanism is always jet-like at larger
217 Froude numbers. At this fluid content the PSD1 mixture exhibits the largest front velocity and after a
218 sudden increase of the barrier load when the flow front arrives, it develops a vertical jet with a
219 corresponding increase of the barrier force up to a maximum when the falling jet breaks on the incoming
220 flow. After this peak, the energy dissipation due to the formation of the hydraulic jump, leads to a
221 decreasing load that is followed by a gradual growth due to the accumulation of the material from the
222 tail of the debris flow surge. For PSD2 and PSD3 which have larger particles, the fluid content has les

223 influence on the flow behaviour. PSD2 at f_c 32% shows the highest run up of the vertical jet, which
224 results both in some material overtopping it and a higher barrier load when the falling jet breaks. The
225 well graded material, PSD3, shows a similar impact behavior compared to that with f_c 28%, the main
226 difference being a greater final static load due to more material being mobilized to reach the barrier.

227 The influence of the particle size on the response of the barrier is clear. PSD2, the uniform flows
228 with the 7.5 mm particles, generate the greatest loads. For the well graded PSD3 tests, similar to PSD2,
229 a number of spikes in the barrier signal are recorded from the load cell, representing collisions of large
230 particles against the barrier; however, both the peak force during and after the impact reach final values
231 similar to those of PSD1 mixture. The peak load due to the initial dynamic impact of the flows appears
232 to be enhanced by the presence of a larger quantity of fluid for all the mixtures. In fact, the higher fluid
233 content allows the mixtures to be more fluidised and hence to reach higher velocities when they move
234 downslope. The larger fluid content also enhances the mobility of the flows, increasing the final static
235 load at the end of the impact due to the greater accumulation of the material behind the wall (Figure 4).

236 Only the PSD2 (uniform, 7.5mm) tests exhibit a consistently higher peak barrier load from the
237 initial dynamic impact than the static load exerted from the material deposited subsequently. The reason
238 for this is that once they hit the barrier at high speed (Table 2), they produce a higher jet wave than other
239 tests, with large particles that are easily mobilized and pushed upward against the barrier. In contrast, it
240 is clear from the high speed images, that for the f_c 28% tests with PSD3, most of the top part of the runup
241 wave is comprised of fluid as the large particles at the flow front are too heavy to be pushed any higher
242 than approximately the middle height of the barrier (Figure 4). Furthermore, the presence of finer
243 material can also have a damping effect on the large particle collisions. The combination of these factors
244 can explain the similar value of the impact load between the 3 mm (PSD1) and the well graded (PSD3)
245 tests.

246 *3.3. Basal pressure development*

247 Figures 5 to 7 show the responses of the pore pressure transducers using a running average
248 filtering window of 400 data points and the evolution of the basal total pressure σ_{tot} . The PPT responses
249 are dominated by the increase in the height of the fluid-saturated debris behind the barrier (which is
250 effectively impermeable) after impact. Therefore, although flows initially pass over PPT4, then PPT3
251 and then PPT2 in succession on their descent motion (resulting in relatively small recorded pressures of
252 the order of 0.2 kPa), PPT2 (closest to the barrier) then produces the largest and earliest response to this
253 impact with recorded pressures ranging between 1 and 2 kPa except for the 3 mm test with f_c 24%
254 characterized by pore pressure below 0.5 kPa. For all the tests at f_c 24% the impact is characterized by
255 the arrival of an initially unsaturated flow front, for which the fluid pressure is absent due to the particles
256 at the front running ahead of the fluid. This becomes more acute as the particle sizes segregate - with the
257 largest particles trending to the front – as seen in field scale debris flows (Iverson, 1997).

258 Considering the measurements closest to the barrier (PPT2 and the basal load cell), differences
259 are found in the pore pressure behaviour after the impact between flows at different fluid content,
260 particularly for the 3mm flows (PSD1) which, considering the ratio of pore pressure to total stress, for
261 f_c 24% shows the pore pressure to be always below hydrostatic, while for f_c 28% it is close to hydrostatic
262 and for f_c 32% above hydrostatic immediately after the breaking of the falling jet.

263 For the well graded flows (PSD3) at both fluid content f_c 28% and 32% the pore pressures are
264 much greater than hydrostatic until the hydraulic jump, developed after the breaking of the falling jet,
265 ends. For the well graded flows at f_c 24%, after the arrival of the unsaturated front, the pore pressure is
266 much larger than hydrostatic until the accumulation of the material behind the barrier occurs, then it
267 drops to typical hydrostatic values. For the 7.5mm flows, the pore pressure is hydrostatic for f_c 24%,
268 slightly above for 28% and largest for f_c 32%.

269 These results demonstrate that excess (i.e. greater than hydrostatic) pore pressures are not
270 necessarily generated within uniform flows of spheres, except where sufficient fluid is present and
271 sufficient agitation is generated (e.g. during an impact event). For well-graded flows (at least for the
272 chosen grading and fluid contents examined here) excess pore pressures are both generated and
273 maintained at impact. This is likely to be due to both larger particles agitating the flow upon impact and
274 fines reducing the mixture permeability, hence maintaining the developed excess pore pressure for
275 longer.

276

277 **Conclusions**

278 The paper presents an experimental investigation on the effects of fluid content and particle size
279 on the impact force generated by a transparent debris-flow model on rigid barrier. The debris flow
280 models were provided by using refractive index-matched mixtures of borosilicate glass beads in a
281 Newtonian fluid. Small-scale flume experiments were carried out using a channel equipped on the
282 bottom with three pore pressure transducers and a load cell for the measure of the total normal stress and
283 fluid pore pressure. A rigid barrier, instrumented with another load cell, was fixed normal to the flume
284 bed at 2.25 m from the gate release. The evolution of the impact load, bed normal pressure and fluid
285 pore pressure for flows consisting of uniform and well graded particle size grading at three different
286 fluid contents, 24%, 28% and 32%, was measured and analyzed. It has been found that excess pore
287 pressures are not necessarily generated within uniform flows of spheres, except where sufficient fluid is
288 present and sufficient agitation is generated (e.g. during an impact event). The particle size of the
289 material has a strong influence on impact loading and overall response. The uniform flows with the
290 largest particles generate the greatest load while for the well graded tests the presence of fine particles

291 within the flow can provide a dampening influence. Larger fluid content leads to greater flow velocity
292 and larger peak load in the initial dynamic phase of impact of the flows. Increasing the amount of the
293 fluid content enhances also the overall mobility of the flows, increasing the final static load at the end of
294 the impact due to the greater accumulation of the material behind the wall.

295 **Acknowledgements**

296 This research was supported through the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council
297 (EPSRC), UK project no. EP/M017427/1 “High speed granular debris flows: new paradigms and
298 interactions in geomechanics”. The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of technicians at
299 the University of Sheffield in the construction of the apparatus. MAC was partly funded by the Early-
300 stage Researcher fund (FAPA) from the Universidad de Los Andes, under the Grant agreement No.
301 PR.3.2016.3667.

302

303 **References**

304 Ahmadipur, A., Qiu, T., and Sheikh, B., 2019, Investigation of basal friction effects on impact
305 force from a granular sliding mass to a rigid obstruction: *Landslides*, Vol. 16, pp.1089-1105,
306 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-019-01156-0>.

307 Albaba, A.; Lambert, S., and Faug, T., 2018, Dry granular avalanche impact force on a rigid
308 wall: Analytic shock solution versus discrete element simulations: *Physical Review E*, Vol. 97 , No.
309 5.

310 Arattano, M., and Franzi, L., 2003, On the evaluation of debris flows dynamics by means of
311 mathematical models: *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 539–544, doi:10.5194/nhess-
312 3-539-2003

313 Armanini, A., 1997, On the dynamic impact of debris flows. In *Recent Development on*
314 *Debris Flows*, Armanini A, Michiue M (eds). Springer, Berlin, Vol. 64, pp 208–226.

315 Armanini A, Larcher M., and Odorizzi M., 2011, Dynamic Impact of a Debris Flow Front
316 Against a Vertical Wall. In *5th International Conference on Debris-flow Hazard Mitigation*,
317 Genevois R, Douglas L (Editor). Casa Editrice Università La Sapienza: Roma, pp.1041–1049.

318 Armanini, A., Rossi, G., and Larcher M., 2019, Dynamic impact of a water and sediments
319 surge against a rigid wall: *Journal of Hydraulic Research*, pp.1-12, doi:
320 10.1080/00221686.2019.1579113.

321 Bugnion, L., McArdell, B., Bartelt, P., and Wendeler, C., 2011, Measurements of hillslope
322 debris-flow impact pressure on obstacles: *Landslides*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 1–9, doi:10.1007/s10346-
323 011-0294-4.

324 Choi, C. E., Au-Yeung, S. C. H., Ng, C.W.W., and Song, D. ,2015, Flume investigation of
325 landslide granular debris and water runup mechanisms: *Géotechnique Letters*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 28-
326 32.

327 Cui, P., Zeng, C., and Lei, Y., 2015, Experimental analysis on the impact force of viscous
328 debris flow: *Earth Surf. Processes Landforms*, Vol.40, pp. 1644–1655, doi:10.1002/esp.3744.

329 Faug, T.; Childs, P.; Wyburn E., and Einav, I., 2015, Standing jumps in shallow granular
330 flows down smooth inclines: *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 27, No. 7.

331 Gray, J.M.N.T.; Tai, Y.C., and Noelle, S., 2003, Shock waves, dead zones and particle-free
332 regions in rapid granular free-surface flows: *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 491 , pp. 161-181

333 Goujon, C., Thomas, N. and Dalloz-Dubrujeaud, B., 2003, Monodisperse dry granular flows
334 on inclined planes: role of roughness: *Eur Phys J E Soft Matter*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 147-157.
335 doi:10.1140/epje/i2003-10012-0. PMID: 15011055.

336 Hu, K., Wei, F., and Li,Y., 2011, Real-time measurement and preliminary analysis of debris-
337 flow impact force at jiangjia ravine, china: *Earth Surf Process Landf.*, Vol. 36, pp. 1268–1278,
338 doi:10.1002/esp.2155 .

339 Hubl, J., Suda, J., Proske, D., Kaitna, R., and Scheidl, C., 2009, Debris-flow impact
340 estimation, In Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Water Management and
341 Hydraulic Engineering, Ohrid, Macedonia.

342 Hungr, O., Leroueil, S., and Picarelli, L., 2013, The Varnes classification of landslide types,
343 an update: *Landslides*, Vol. 11, pp. 167-194.

344 Iverson, R.M., 1997, The physics of debris flows: *Reviews of Geophysics*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp.
345 245-296.

346 Iverson, R.M., George, D.L., and Logan, M., 2016, Debris-flow run-up on vertical barriers
347 and adverse slopes: *Journal of Geophysical Research-Earth Surface*, Vol. 121, pp. 2333–2357,
348 doi:10.1002/2016JF003933.

349 Moriguchi, S., Borja, R., Yashima, A., and Sawada, K., 2009, Estimating the impact force
350 generated by granular flow on a rigid obstruction: *Acta Geotech.*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 57–71.

351 Sanvitale, N. and Bowman, E.T., 2012, Internal imaging of saturated granular free-surface
352 flows: *International Journal of Physical Modelling in Geotechnics*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 129-142.

353 Sanvitale, N. and Bowman, E.T., 2017, Visualization of dominant stress-transfer mechanisms
354 in experimental debris flows of different particle-size distribution: *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*,
355 Vol.54, No. 2, pp. 258-269.

356 Scheidl, C., Chiari, M., Kaitna, R., Mullegger, M., Krawtschuk, A., Zimmermann, T., and
357 Proske, D., 2012, Analysing debris-flow impact models, based on a small scale modelling approach:
358 *Surveys in Geophysics*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp.121–40.

359 Silbert, L.E., Ertas, D., Grest, G.S., Halsey, T.C., Levine, D. and Plimpton S.J., 2001,
360 Granular flow down an inclined plane: Bagnold scaling and rheology: *Phys. Rev. E*, Vol. 64, No.5,
361 doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.64.051302.

362 Stohr, M., Roth, K., and Jahne, B., 2003, Measurement of 3D porescale flow in index-
363 matched porous media: *Experiments in Fluids*, Vol.35, No. 2, pp. 159–166.

364 Takahashi, T. 2007. *Debris flow: Mechanics, prediction and countermeasures*. Taylor &
365 Francis.

366 Thielicke, W., and Stamhuis, E.J., 2014, PIVlab – Towards User-friendly, Affordable and
367 Accurate Digital Particle Image Velocimetry in MATLAB: *Journal of Open Research Software*,
368 2(1):e30, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/jors.bl>.

369 Thielicke, W., 2014, *The Flapping Flight of Birds - Analysis and Application*, Phd thesis,
370 Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. <http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/382783069>.


371 Van Dine, D.F., 1996, Debris flow control structures for forest engineering: Working paper,
372 Ministry of Forest Research Program, Victoria, British Columbia

373 Zhang, S., 1993, A comprehensive approach to the observation and prevention of debris
374 flows in china: *Natural Hazards*, Vol. 7, pp 1–23, doi:10.1007/BF00595676

375 Zhou, G.G.D., Song, D., Choi, C.E., Pasuto, A., Sun, Q.C., and Dai, D.F., 2018, Surge impact
376 behaviour of granular flows: effects of water content: *Landslides*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 695-709.

377

378 **Figures**



379 Figure 1. Apparatus employed in the tests. (Inset) PLIF setup

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390





Figure 2. Particle size distributions (PSDs) for the solid materials used in the tests

391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410



411 Figure 3. Sequences of the images recorded by the high speed camera for (a) PSD1 at fc of 24%, (b) PSD2
 412 at fc of 24%, (c) PSD3 at fc of 32%. The overlapped arrows describe the corresponding velocity field
 413 estimated using PIV analysis




Figure 4. Measured run-up height at the barrier (time $t=0$ is the time of the flow front arrival)

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427


428

429

430

431


432




433 Figure 5. Fluid content 24% (Left) Load on barrier (Right) Basal pressures (a) PSD1, (b) PSD2, (c) PSD3

434

435



436 Figure 6. Fluid content 28% (Left) Load on barrier (Right) Basal pressures (a) PSD1, (b) PSD2,
 437 (c) PSD3. The red oval points out the breaking of the jet on the free surface of the incoming flow.



438 Figure 7. Fluid content 32% (Left) Load on barrier (Right) Basal pressures (a) PSD1, (b) PSD2,
 439 (c) PSD3. The red oval points out the breaking of the jet on the free surface of the incoming flow.

440