SAND2022-12024C

This paper describes objective technical results and analysis. Any subjective views or opinions that might be expressed in the paper do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Department of Energy or the United States Government.



MISSISSIPPI RIVER CHARACTERIZATION FOR CURRENT ENERGY CONVERTER (CEC) SYSTEMS





PRESENTED BY

Nhu Nguyen, Budi Gunawan, Cesar Castillo, and Marie Caspard

Portland, Oregon

September 13-15, 2022





Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology & Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.

Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology & Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.

Contents

- Research Motivation and Objectives
- Numerical Model
 - SNL-Delft3D Flexible Mesh Turbine Modeling Integration
 - Setup and simulated cases
- Results
 - Model Calibration with field data
 - Parametric studies:
 - Depth average velocities vs flow percentile
 - Cross-sectional velocities at select locations
- Conclusions and Future Work

Research Motivation and Objectives



Potential Riverine Hydrokinetic Resource¹

ORPC RivGen Development

3

- **2014** Deployed and operated in Kvichak River (Village of Igiugig, Alaska).
- **2015** Reinstalled and demonstrated operations for 2 months.
- 2018 License to install and operate a RivGen® Power System.
- **2021** RivGen 2.1 Power System deployed long term in Kvichak River.
- **2022** Addition of a second RivGen is deployed in the River.



Photo credit: ORPC



(1) Ravens, T., Cunningham, K. and Scott, G., 2012. Assessment and mapping of the riverine hydrokinetic energy resource in the continental United States. *Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, Retrieved: http://water. energy. gov/pdfs/riverine hydrokinetic resource assessment and mapping. pdf.*

Research Motivation and Objectives



Potential Riverine Hydrokinetic Resource¹

Study Approach

4

- International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) TC 114 PT 62600-301 Marine Energy - Wave, tidal and other water current converters
 Part 301: River energy resource assessment and characterization.
- Annual energy production calculated using modeling and long term historical data (>=10 years).



Next Gen

Photo credit: ORPC



Modular

(1) Ravens, T., Cunningham, K. and Scott, G., 2012. Assessment and mapping of the riverine hydrokinetic energy resource in the continental United States. *Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, Retrieved: http://water. energy. gov/pdfs/riverine hydrokinetic resource assessment and mapping. pdf.*

Data Sources:

- NHDPlus V2: Modeled discharge and velocity across entire National Hydrography Dataset
- USGS National Water Information System (NWIS): Measured discharge and flow speed and select stream gages

Process:

- Screened NHDPlus river segments for minimum velocities
- Developed Visual Basic Code to generate NWIS stream gage statistics
- Screened stream gage statistics for minimum depth, velocity, field measurements and other river characteristics
- Selected areas with favorable NWIS and NHDPlus values
- Outreach to USGS and Army Corps staff for further site validation





Field Data Available for Modeling

Geometric component for hydrodynamic model

- Land model component
 - Bathymetry
 - GIS layers from USACE of bathymetry in 2019 for navigable portions of main channel
 - Longitudinal profiles from USACE of 2014 Low Water Reference Plane
 - River bank and floodplain topography
 - GIS layers from USGS of National Elevation Dataset for floodplain topography
 - River waters edge, centerline, and banks
 - Delineated using USDA National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) imagery from 2018

Hydrologic boundary conditions for model

- Inlet: Discharge
 - USGS discharge and water level gaging station at St. Louis, MO
- Outlet: Water Level
 - USGS discharge and water level gaging station at Chester, IL
- Calibration stations
 - USACE water level gaging stations at Engineers Dept, Jefferson Barracks, and Herculaneum





Numerical Modeling

Delft3D Flexible Mesh

SNL-Delft3D

SNL-Delft3D – Turbine Integration Modeling

Delft3D Flexible Mesh Suites

• 2D/3D modeling

8

- Finite Volume method
- Both z and σ layers are supported.
- RANS Navier Stokes:
 - Shallow water equation

 $\frac{D\omega}{Dt} \ll g$

SNL-Delft3D model

Momentum loss

Turbulence source

Turbulence dissipation

U: flow velocity *A*: turbine frontal area C_T : thrust coefficient β_p , β_d , $C_{\varepsilon 4}$: optional canopy coefficients

 $S_Q = -\frac{1}{2}C_T A U^2$

 $S_{k} = \frac{1}{2}C_{\mathrm{T}}A(\beta_{\mathrm{p}}U^{3} - \beta_{\mathrm{d}}Uk),$

 $S_{\varepsilon} = C_{\varepsilon^4} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} S_k,$

Program @ https://github.com/SNL-WaterPower/SNL-Delft3D-FM-CEC



(2) Gunawan, B., Neary, V.S., Mortensen, J. and Roberts, J.D., 2017. *Assessing and Testing Hydrokinetic Turbine Performance and Effects on Open Channel Hydrodynamics: An Irrigation Canal Case Study* (No. SAND-2017-4925R). Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States).

(3) Roberts, J., Nelson, K., Jones, C. and James, S.C., 2014. A framework for optimizing the placement of current energy converters.

ħ

Grid construction

۲

1. St. Louis

3. Jefferson Barracks

2. Engineers Depot

9

Legend

FlowFM

Bed Level

137.6 133.3 128.9

124.5

120.2

115.8 111.5 107.1 102.7 98.36 94





No. Elements (~)

Edge Length (m)

Max Orthogonality

Inlet Conditions

Simulation Matrix

Grid 1

Х

Y

Grid 2

Х



	Discharge $(m^3 s^{-1})$
15 th	2888.3
25 th	3539.6
50 th	5663.4
75 th	9231.3
90 th	12969.1

$CFL = \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta x}$	0.35	0.7	1.4	
$u\Delta t$	Courant Numbers			
90 th	x	Х	Х	
75 th	X	Х	Х	
50 th	X	Х	Х	
25 th	X	Х	Х	

Outlet Conditions



	Water Level (m)
15 th	105.4
25 th	106.0
50 th	108.1
75 th	110.8
90 th	112.8

Bed Roughness

15th

25th

Model: Manning

Values (n): 0.01-0.029 (Glass to Earth weedy channel)

Grid 3

Х



Delft3D Flexible Mesh

SNL-Delft3D

12 Mesh Convergence Study



Station ID

Station ID

Time Convergence Check 13

125

121.67

121.668

121.666

Ê 121.664

121.662

121.66

121.658

121.656

↓ V

9 Jan

time \rightarrow

0.35 (~53hrs)



Time Settings:

- Dt Initial: **1**s
- Dt Max: 30s
- CFL: 0.35, 0.7, and 1.4 ٠
- *Note: D3D recommend CFL ≤ 0.7 •





4



time -

► V

Time Convergence Study - 800K Mesh - 75th Percentile Flow 10 Jan 9 Jan time \rightarrow ► V

Results: converged to ٠ within 0.06% of WD.

25th, 50th, and 90th Percentile Flow Water Level



15th Percentile Flow – Water Level





15th Percentile Flow – Bed Roughness Calibration

0.0105

75th Percentile Flow – Water Level





17

75th Percentile Flow – Bed Roughness Calibration



¹⁹ Water Level Across Flow Percentiles



²⁰ Bed Shear Stress Across Flow Percentiles



Total bed shear stress - mesh2d_nFaces: mean (N m-2)



Cross-sectional velocity (m/s) - Line 1:



Cross-sectional velocity (m/s) - Line 2:



Conclusion and Future work



- Numerical simulations of **70 mile of Mississippi River**.
- Five conditions were studied: 15th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th.
- Bed Roughness study was conducted to calibrate the model at five stations: St. Louis, Engineers Depot, Jefferson Barracks, Herculaneum, and Chester.
- Water level outputs from the model achieve maximum difference of 6 percent compared with published field data.
- **Cross-sectional velocities, bed shear stress, and water level** information will help identify potential deployment sites.
- <u>Future work:</u>
 - Re-simulating the River model including the Rivgen turbines.
 - Optimizes the turbine array configuration for power outputs and minimal bottom shear stress increases.

