

# SURGE ANALYSIS AND THE WAVE PLAN METHOD

A Powerful, Accurate, and Stable Method for  
Water Hammer Studies



Srinivasa Lingireddy  
Don J. Wood



---

# SURGE ANALYSIS AND THE WAVE PLAN METHOD

A Powerful, Accurate, and Stable Method for  
Water Hammer Studies

---



---

# SURGE ANALYSIS AND THE WAVE PLAN METHOD

A Powerful, Accurate, and Stable Method for  
Water Hammer Studies

---

Srinivasa Lingireddy  
and  
Don J. Wood

KYPIPE LLC, USA



---

# SURGE ANALYSIS AND THE WAVE PLAN METHOD

A Powerful, Accurate, and Stable Method for  
Water Hammer Studies

---

First Edition

**Srinivasa Lingireddy, Ph.D.**

KYPIPE LLC

**Don J. Wood, Ph.D.**

Professor, Emeritus  
University of Kentucky

KYPIPE LLC, USA

---

# SURGE ANALYSIS AND THE WAVE PLAN METHOD

## A Powerful, Accurate, and Stable Method for Water Hammer Studies

---

First Edition

© 2021 by KYPIPE LLC. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be copied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, performed, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of KYPIPE LLC.

ISBN 978-1-7372753-0-5

Printed in the United States of America.

Information contained in this publication has been obtained by KYPIPE LLC from sources believed to be reliable. However, neither KYPIPE LLC nor its authors guarantee or warrant the correctness, accuracy, or completeness of any information (including but not limited to tabulated data, data presented in text, graphs, images, and illustrations) contained in this work, and neither KYPIPE LLC, its affiliates or subsidiaries, nor the authors of this publication, shall be responsible or liable for any errors, omissions, or damages arising out of or in connection with the use, or the results of use, of this publication or any information contained herein. This work is published by KYPIPE LLC and its authors for informational purposes only and does not constitute engineering or professional services.

KYPIPE LLC  
710 Tom's Creek  
Cary, NC 27519 USA

Phone: +1 469 250 1362  
Email: [orders@kypipe.com](mailto:orders@kypipe.com)  
Internet: [www.kypipe.com](http://www.kypipe.com)



*To my beloved wife Anuradha, who left her fulfilling career and cozy suburban life to let me travel the world in pursuit of practical knowledge on water hammer problems. I am forever indebted to her for her unwavering support and sacrifices. To my children, who never protested moving to unfamiliar places at a young age, and for taking on the challenges of these transitions with stride. Thank you!*

SL

*To my children. I am forever grateful they chose to share and carry on my life's work.*

DJW

# Brief Contents

Foreword	vii
Preface	viii
Acknowledgements	x
Introduction	xi
Chapter 1: Wave Plan Method	1
Chapter 2: Why WPM?	38
Chapter 3: What Causes Surge?	47
Chapter 4: Effects of Surge Pressures	66
Chapter 5: Surge Protection	75
Chapter 6: Air Valves	116
Chapter 7: Assumptions and Uncertainties	138
Appendix A: Non-uniform Spatial Grid	155
Appendix B: MOC and its Struggles to Compete with WPM	167
Appendix C: Attenuation of Pressure	186
Appendix D: Wave Speed	206
Appendix E: Air-Water Interface	218
Appendix F: Air Valves and Common Misconceptions	235
Appendix G: Pumps and Turbines	240
Appendix H: Check Valves	264
Appendix I: WPM Bibliography	284
Appendix J: References	287
Index:	291

# Contents

## CHAPTER 1: Wave Plan Method

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 What is Surge?	1
1.2 Unsteady Flow Field	7
1.3 Pressure Waves	9
1.4 Magnitude and Speed of Pressure Waves	14
1.4.1 Celerity and Pressure Rise	17
1.4.2 Wave Period	18
1.5 Wave Action at Junctions	19
1.6 Wave Action at Reservoirs and Dead Ends	22
1.7 Friction Effect on Pressure Waves	25
1.8 Wave Action at Connected Devices	29
1.9 Wave Plan Method	30
1.10 Water Hammer	33

## CHAPTER 2: Why WPM?

2.1 Surge Analysis	39
2.2 Assumptions and Uncertainties	40
2.3 Real-life Challenges	40
2.4 Literature Anxiety	42
2.5 The Power of WPM	43
2.6 Eye-opener	46

## CHAPTER 3: What Causes Surge?

3.1 Common Knowledge	49
3.2 Not So Common Knowledge	49
3.3 What Causes Surge?	50
3.4 The Common Thread	52
3.5 How Rapid is Rapid?	52
3.6 Pump Operation	54
3.7 Pipe Filling	56
3.8 Pressure Spikes	56
3.8.1 Air Slam	57
3.8.2 Check Valve Slam	59
3.8.3 Vapor Cavity Slam	62
3.9 Fire Hydrant Operation	63
3.10 Are All Isolation Valves the Same?	64
3.11 Summary	67

## CHAPTER 4: Effects of Surge Pressures

4.1 Design Considerations	69
4.2 Pressure Rating	69
4.3 Short-Term Effects	72
4.4 Long-Term Effects	76

## CHAPTER 5: Surge Protection

5.1 Protection Choices	79
5.1.1 New Pipeline Systems	79
5.1.2 Existing Pipeline Systems	80
5.2 Knowledge is Power!	81
5.3 Protection Devices	83
5.4 Relief Valves	85
5.4.1 Pressure Relief Valves	86
5.4.2 Surge Anticipation Valves	91
5.4.2.1 Conventional Surge Anticipation Valve	93
5.4.2.2 Hydraulically Actuated SAV	93
5.4.2.3 Electrically Actuated SAV	94
5.5 Air Valves	94
5.6 Surge Tanks	95
5.6.1 One-way Surge Tanks	101
5.6.2 Compressor Surge Tanks	105
5.6.2.1 Connection Resistance	106
5.6.2.2 Replenish Dissolved Air	107
5.6.2.3 Volume Ratio	109
5.6.2.4 Pre-charge	110
5.6.2.5 Pros and Cons	111
5.6.3 Bladder Surge Tanks	112
5.6.3.1 Virtually Maintenance Free	113
5.6.3.2 Bladder Fitness	113
5.6.3.3 Pre-charge	114
5.6.3.4 Pros and Cons	115
5.6.4 Hybrid Surge Tanks	116
5.6.4.1 Pre-charge	117
5.6.4.2 Limitations	117
5.7 Device Selection	118

## CHAPTER 6: Air Valves

6.1 Air Management	120
6.2 Need for Air Valves	120
6.3 Pathways for Air Intrusion	121
6.4 Air Propagation	123
6.5 Types of Air Valves	123
6.5.1 Kinetic Air Valves	124
6.5.2 Automatic Air Valves	124
6.5.3 Non-slam Air Valves	128
6.5.4 Dynamic Air Valves	130
6.6 Modeling Air Flow in Pipelines	131
6.6.1 Mass Flowrates	131
6.6.2 Air Valve Modeling	133
6.6.3 Special Considerations	135

6.6.3.1 Pressures Greater than Atmospheric Values and Zero Air Volume	136
6.6.3.2 When Air Cavity Collapses	136
6.6.3.3 Non-slam Air Valves	136
6.6.3.4 Dynamic Air Valves	137
6.7 Reality Check	138
6.7.1 Free Surface in a Long Stretch of Pipeline	138
6.7.2 Air Enters at One Air Valve and Exits from an Adjacent Air Valve	140
6.7.3 Trapped Air Pockets at Dead Ends	140
6.8 Concluding Remarks	141

## CHAPTER 7: Assumptions and Uncertainties

7.1 Dependable Surge Analysis	142
7.1.1 Solution Techniques	142
7.1.2 Data Accuracy	142
7.1.3 Modeler Experience and Training	143
7.2 Assumptions	143
7.2.1 One-dimensional Flow and Constant Density	143
7.2.2 Closed-Conduit Flows and Air Valves	144
7.2.2.1 Protection with Bladder Tanks and Air Valves (Scenario I)	145
7.2.2.2 Protection with Only Bladder Tanks (Scenario II)	145
7.2.2.3 Protection with Bladder Tanks and a One-way Surge Tank (Scenario III)	147
7.2.2.4 Role of Air Valves in Surge Protection	149
7.2.3 End Reservoir Boundary Conditions	150
7.2.4 Pressure Waves are Continuous Entities	150
7.2.5 Assigned Wave Speeds Remain Unchanged	151
7.2.6 Steady vs. Unsteady Friction	151
7.2.7 Check Valve Characteristics	151
7.2.8 Nondimensional Pump and Turbine Characteristics	152
7.2.9 Fixed vs. Pressure-Sensitive Demands	152
7.2.10 Surge Protection Devices	152
7.3 Uncertainties	153
7.4 Factor of Safety	155
7.5 Sensitivity Analyses	157

## APPENDIX A: Non-uniform Spatial Grid

A.1 Computational Grid	160
A.2 Single vs. Multiple Friction Elements	160
A.3 Effect of Celerity	168
A.4 Summary	170

## APPENDIX B: MOC and its Struggles to Compete with WPM

B.1 Surge Analysis	172
B.2 MOC For a Line Segment	172
B.3 MOC for Pipeline Systems	175
B.4 Computational Grid	176
B.5 Chasing a Problem That Has Long Been Addressed	177
B.6 MOC has No Unique Solution	178
B.7 WPM is Unique, Stable and Highly Superior	185
B.8 End of Discussion.	189

## APPENDIX C: Attenuation of Pressure

C.1 Persistent Problem	192
C.2 Unsteady Friction	194
C.3 Attenuation of Pressure	195
C.3.1 Case 1	195
C.3.2 Case 2	196
C.3.3 Case 3	197
C.3.4 Case 4	197
C.3.5 Case 5	199
C.3.6 Case 6	199
C.3.7 Case 7	200
C.3.8 Case 8	201
C.3.9 Case 9	202
C.3.10 Summary of Results	202
C.4 Complex Models	207
C.5 Validity of Theories	209

## APPENDIX D: Wave Speed

D.1 Mechanical Waves	213
D.2 Pressure Waves	214
D.3 Pipe Restraints	214
D.3.1 Thin-walled Pipes	214
D.3.2 Thick-walled Pipes	215
D.3.3 Pressure Tunnels	215
D.3.4 Celerity	216
D.4 Elastic Moduli	216
D.5 Uncertainties	217
D.5.1 Restraint Coefficient	218
D.5.2 Pipe Diameter and Thickness	219
D.5.3 Young's Modulus	221
D.5.4 Density	221
D.5.5 Bulk Modulus	221

## **APPENDIX E: Air-Water Interface**

E.1 Air is Inevitable in Most Pipelines	225
E.2 Solubility of Air	225
E.3 Air-Water Interface	226
E.4 Effects of a Disappearing Air Pocket	228
E.5 Vapor Pressure	231
E.6 Suspended vs. Dissolved Air	234
E.7 Air in Water Columns	235
E.8 Transport of Air	236
E.9 Polytropic Process	240
E.10 Moist Air and Corrosion	241

## **APPENDIX F: Air Valves and Common Misconceptions**

F.1 Common Misconceptions	243
---------------------------	-----

## **APPENDIX G: Pumps and Turbines**

G.1 Introduction	249
G.2 Rotating Objects	249
G.3 Turbomachines	251
G.4 Pumps	253
G.4.1 Head-Flow-Speed Relationship	253
G.4.2 Role of Torque	255
G.4.3 Pump Classification	256
G.4.4 Torque-Head-Flow-Speed characteristics	259
G.5 Hydro Turbines	267
G.5.1 Turbine Classification	267
G.5.2 Torque-Head-Flow-Speed Characteristics	267
G.6 Dependability of Industry	
Standard Data for Modeling Pumps	270

## **APPENDIX H: Check Valves**

H.0 Introduction	273
H.1 Applications	273
H.2 Flow Reversal Through a Check Valve	274
H.3 Types of Check Valves	276
H.3.1 Swing Check Valves	276
H.3.2 Ball Check Valves	277
H.3.3 Spring-loaded Check Valves	278
H.3.4 Hydro-pneumatic Check Valves	279
H.3.5 Pump Control Valves	279
H.3.6 Electrically Actuated Check Valves	279
H.4 Check Valve Modeling	279
H.5 Modeling Swing Check Valves	280
H.5.1 Opening Cycle	280
H.5.2 Closing Cycle	283
H.5.3 Angular Motion in Stagnant Liquid	284
H.5.4 Effects of Deceleration	285
H.5.5 Flow Characteristics	
Upon Flow Reversal	287
H.6 Dynamic Characteristics	289
H.7 Summary	293

## **APPENDIX I: WPM Bibliography**

## **APPENDIX J: References**

## **INDEX**



# Foreword

It was more than 60 years ago as a Carnegie Mellon graduate student that I listened to my professor Dr. Thomas E. Stelson's lecture on the subject of pressure waves resulting from a valve closure. This was the inspiration for my doctoral thesis on pressure waves at junctions. From that time until now, my work, and that of my colleague Dr. Srinivasa Lingireddy, has been researching transients, developing analytical tools and making those tools ever more relevant and powerful as demanded by the industries of today.

The first analytical tools I developed were for NASA in the 1960s. As I envisioned the pressure waves transmitted through NASA's propellant systems, the analytical method that evolved was very natural and efficient, and this work on relatively simple systems provided the basis of what was later to be known as the Wave Plan Method.

The jump from simple systems to larger networks came soon after. I was involved in a bio-engineering project to determine the flow through capillaries during system shock. I was compelled to see if I could apply the effects of turbulent flow to these improvements in network modeling. This prompted the development of a Surge analysis tool based on the Wave Plan Method.

The Wave Plan Method is a simple, intuitive, and most importantly an accurate approach based on the principle that all pressure waves travel at sonic speeds, making it possible to predict when they will arrive at junctions and devices as they travel through pipes. This allows an analytical model to calculate the effects of the waves only at junctions and devices, with appropriate modifications for friction loss, as opposed to calculating their effects at multiple incremental points between junctions and devices. The simplicity of the method is really what makes the Wave Plan Method indispensable to the hydraulics industry. Large networks can be easily and efficiently analyzed. The other accepted method, the Method of Characteristics, is inefficient at handling large networks due to its requirement for incremental calculations between junctions and devices.

At the University of Kentucky, we made this analytical tool available to other researchers and institutions. Eventually it became clear that utilities and other industries had a great need for such a powerful and efficient tool to model transient conditions in their piping systems. The software that became the industry standard and the Wave Plan Method that powers it have been in continual use and development to this day.

It was at the University of Kentucky that Dr. Srinivasa Lingireddy and other esteemed professors joined me in the development of transient software. Dr. Lingireddy's pioneering work in genetic algorithms and component (protection device) modeling expanded greatly on the Wave Plan Method's capabilities. Ever since he joined in this endeavor, he has been a driving force behind the research and development of this method and the software packages that support it. His involvement over many years with industry outside academia, with engineers, operators, regulators, and even with manufacturing, has honed his knowledge and skills to the point where, in my opinion, there is no one in the world who equals his knowledge and expertise.

This book brings together decades of experience in modeling, engineering and software development. My own work, and the work of many others, is represented in these pages. But most of the work has been Dr. Lingireddy's. He has truly taken the helm of a life's work that began with a youthful intrigue. Dr. Lingireddy has helped me to make this method one that is utilized by thousands of engineers and operators in a multitude of countries around the world. He is truly the best choice for an author on this subject, and I am grateful that he has chosen to share his knowledge with industries and the world in this excellent book.

*Don J. Wood*

# Preface

Let me begin this preface by thanking the University of Kentucky, the place I had called home for 16 years, for granting me a sabbatical in 2005. The extensive world travel during the sabbatical year made me realize how little I knew about the real-world water hammer challenges, without exaggeration! This was despite my more than a decade of academic experience on unsteady flows, several years of close interactions with many surge modelers, and a complete grasp on the source code of the most widely used surge analysis software.

The sabbatical allowed me to meet with some of the finest practicing engineers, utility managers, and research and development specialists from Europe, Israel, United Arab Emirates, Oman, China, and India. I was also confronted with many unanswered questions. The existing books were not of much help as most of them focused on the complexities of the computational techniques and not on the real-world challenges. None had answers to questions such as: Would there be limits on opening and closing times for relief valves? Why placing a check valve in the middle of a long pipeline as a surge protection device is a bad idea, while theoretically it appears like a great idea? Can there be a delay in the activation of an air valve on down surge? etc. I was well-aware of the significant amounts of water loss through leakage even in the highly regulated distribution networks of the United States, but did not quite understand why such widespread leakages would develop in the first place? Why do we invest in efforts such as pressure management in controlling water loss through leakage instead of addressing the root causes of the leakage, i.e., broken pipe joints and cracked pipes? What causes the pipe joints to fail in these highly regulated water distribution networks that are required to maintain a minimum positive pressure of 20 psi (14m) under all demand conditions? Why are hundreds of “boil water” advisories issued every year even in technologically advanced countries like the US and Canada?

The sabbatical has inspired me to take the plunge and seek answers to the real-world water hammer problems. It prompted me to take up the challenge of solving at least one real-world problem involving a heavily battered water supply system. Countless number of hours spent with research and development specialists of the surge protection equipment helped me understand the intricate details of the diverse set of equipment and their relation to surge modeling. Close interaction with pump and check valve manufacturers, and pump station operators helped me appreciate the complex inter-relationships between various equipment within the pump station. On one occasion, I learned how a pump station check valve that has been operating trouble-free since its installation started generating severe slam pressures after a benign act of installing a large, compressed air tank at a location downstream of the check valve. The compressor air tank was required to protect the main pipeline from periodic burst events. Participation in several forensic studies allowed me to understand what matters the most in controlling pressure surges arising from the pump station equipment. Forensic investigations also allowed me to appreciate how certain seemingly irrelevant devices can cause destructive surge pressures at some faraway places within the pipeline systems. For example, in a well-conceived and well-constructed pipeline project comprising roughly 60 km of 2000 mm diameter pipeline and several one-way surge tanks, the periodic burst events close to the pump station were traced to an air valve roughly 40 km away from the pump station. Sadly, serious forensic investigations were initiated only after the fourth burst event that resulted in the death of a cyclist. The air valve in question was not part of the surge protection system and was intended only for routine filling and draining operations!

The strength of materials was not one of my strong areas and I had to relearn the subject after realizing that understanding the pressure rating of pipelines is fundamental to surge modeling. On the other hand, optimization was one of my strong areas and a thorough knowledge on pressure ratings helped me redesign certain pipeline projects, bringing substantial savings to either surge protection cost, pipeline cost, or both. Understanding the strength of materials is also important as pipes of different material react differently to



surge pressures. For example, an intense positive pressure wave traversing a welded mild steel pipeline of certain rated pressure would burst the pipeline at the weakest point leaving rest of the pipeline practically intact. However, the same pressure wave traversing a glass reinforced plastic (GRP) pipeline of identical pressure rating can inflict hairline cracks at multiple locations, in addition to bursting the pipeline at its weakest point. This is despite the fact that GRP pipe is considered as one of the great modern inventions. The hairline cracks become trouble spots and future burst locations even when not so intense pressure waves traverse the pipeline later. In certain parts of the world, pipe burst events are considered acceptable when they occur during the commissioning stage of the project. Such a viewpoint might lead to perpetual leakages and burst events when GRP pipelines or pipelines with similar characteristics (for example, asbestos cement, reinforced concrete, and prestressed concrete) are used in the project.

In the developed countries, the loss of water through leakage is dominant only in the distribution networks. However, the loss of water through leakage is ubiquitous even in bulk water pipeline systems of the developing world. Frequent power outages coupled with inadequate surge protection or improper use of check valves (sometimes called zero velocity valves) as surge protection devices appear to have resulted in numerous distributed leakages in many bulk water supply pipelines. The efficiency of some of the highly battered bulk water pipeline systems is below 50%. Improper air management on these bulk water systems resulted in significant increase in power consumption which goes unnoticed due to lack of energy audits. A thorough understanding of the causes of widespread leakages on the bulk water pipelines should provide answers to persistent leakage problems in the distribution networks.

Roughly a decade after diving into the real-world in 2007, my team and I have successfully rehabilitated a bulk water supply pipeline that was experiencing at least one pipe burst event each week (see Section 5.1.2 of this book) and proved that even highly battered pipeline systems can be brought back to life with suitable surge protection. In the last 15 years, I designed surge protection for more than hundred bulk water pipelines and scores of irrigation pipe distribution networks comprising several hundred kilometers of large diameter (>2000 mm) pipeline. A total of about 200 bladder surge tanks, scores of relief valves, and hundreds of non-slam air valves were used in protecting these pipeline systems. I worked with 20 mm diameter pipelines carrying cryogenic liquid as well as 5000 mm diameter bulk water cross-country pipelines. While most pipelines carried water at normal velocity limits of 2.5 m/s or less, I have also dealt with pipelines discharging water at an abnormally high 8 m/s velocity.

My world travel did not stop during this period. I used seminars and training courses as opportunities for two-way learning. Some of the most intriguing questions were from engineers of Inner Mongolia and Uganda during my lectures. This book is an effort at sharing the collective knowledge on the practical and intricate details pertaining to surge modeling. Based on the recent literature, the focus of the academic world continues to be on the surge analysis problems that are disconnected from the real-world challenges as illustrated in several sections of this book. This book is also an attempt at bridging that gap and motivating future researchers to find solutions to the persistent real-world challenges related to water hammer.

*Srini Lingireddy*

# Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Don J. Wood for agreeing to coauthor this book. It is a great honor to be associated with the legend who revolutionized the pipe network modeling through his pioneering work in both steady state and unsteady state hydraulics. I learned not only the science of surge modeling but also the art of surge modeling from Dr. Wood, for which I am eternally grateful.

Book-writing is a long journey, and the information presented in this book is based on the cumulative knowledge of so many engineers and specialists who were a part of it. There were also several milestones along this journey, and I must thank everyone involved in those key moments. Mr. Naftali Zloczower, for introducing me to the modern air valves in the late 1990s, and for dragging me during my sabbatical to the breathtaking Kfar Haruv overlooking the Sea of Galilee for a 3-day seminar with several dozen practicing engineers from around the world. The exchange of ideas during that visit with a budding entrepreneur, Milind Murudkar, changed the trajectory of my professional career. Dr. Fanie Van Vuuren, the world-renowned expert on air valves for teaching the fundamentals of subject, and Pini Vardy for teaching all the practical aspects of air valves. Mike Hager, for sharing his knowledge and wisdom on bladder tanks. Yoav Tabenken, Ilan Ulman, Amir Livne, and the late Ezra Sabbagh, for sharing their immense knowledge on control valves. I must thank two other people who shaped my career leading to this book. Dr. K. Elango, who taught me how to conduct research and be an independent thinker, and more importantly for giving me the opportunity to work on many real-world water supply and distribution challenges right on the beautiful 640-acre campus of my alma mater, the IIT Madras. And Dr. Lindell Ormsbee, for being a wonderful teacher and mentor all through my tenure at the University of Kentucky. I could always count on him. Thank you, Dr. Ormsbee.

Vision tends to get blurry when you are done writing a few hundred pages of text, and you need eagle-eyed experts willing to spend their precious time looking for omissions and errors. I would like to thank Pani Ramalingam, Naftali Zloczower, Ferran Guillén, Sathish Kumar, Mokhtar Morsy, Eric Liebenauer, and Jana Faith for reviewing one or more chapters combing for mistakes and providing constructive comments. All remaining errors and omissions are solely my responsibility. I would also like to thank Hilla Sagi, Maya Fisher, Idit Bejerano Ben Schch, and Mike Hager for providing several of the images and illustrations, and Karthic Rangarajan and Sathish Kumar for coordinating with the publishers.

My special thanks to Mr. Eric Liebenauer, for a critical review and thorough editing of the entire manuscript. His extraordinary editing skills, coupled with his in-depth understanding of the surge modeling process helped to shape the manuscript into this book in a relatively short time. My special thanks are also to Jana Faith and Doug Wood for their continued support from the beginning of this book-writing project. Thank you.

*Srini Lingireddy*

# Introduction

Design of effective surge protection involves building an accurate model of the pipeline system, use of a reliable solution technique, and a modeler who understands all the intricacies of surge analysis. Advances in computing technology and human interface tools have reduced and streamlined model building efforts substantially. Powerful, accurate and numerically stable solution techniques such as the wave plan method (WPM) with decades of excellent track record eliminate the search for reliable modeling tools. There are many modelers who are well-versed in surge analysis through decades of experience. However, for those with little or no experience, the authors have not come across a book that details all the intricacies of surge modeling. Accordingly, the objective of this book is to explore these intricacies in detail, using the lessons learned through decades of surge protection design experience, including close interaction with pump station operators and field personnel, utility managers, fire protection specialists, research and development specialists of surge protection equipment, surge modeling consultants, and academics. The material is presented in seven chapters and several appendices. The chapters describe broader concepts in a logical way starting with the description of surge analysis tools, followed by causes and effects of surge events, methods of protecting the pipeline systems from extreme surge pressures, and assumptions and uncertainties encountered during surge analysis. The appendices provide corroborative material for several of the broader concepts described in various chapters and include many of the intricate details pertaining to the surge analysis. By bringing to light all the intricate details including the limitations of surge modeling and ways to overcome those limitations, the book is expected to instill greater confidence in undertaking surge analysis works. A summary of each chapter and appendix is provided in the following.

**Chapter 1** describes the basic elements of surge analysis by introducing WPM, a powerful solution technique based on intuitive wave propagation mechanics. The mechanics of wave propagation are first illustrated using a simple reservoir-pipe-valve system which ignores friction losses; this example demonstrates the use of Joukowski's equation, which is the foundation upon which all surge analysis techniques are built. Simple mathematical equations governing the reflection and transmission of pressure waves at junction nodes are introduced next. Discovery of these equations in the late 1950s formed the basis of the powerful WPM. The analysis of friction losses using friction elements is then discussed. WPM has proven to be the most powerful method and it derives that power from the use of friction elements that allow for the much sought-after nonlinear spatial computational grid. The concept of friction elements was then extended to describe the modeling of various components of pipeline systems. Appendix A is a companion section to Chapter 1 and provides an in-depth analysis on the role of friction in the discretization of the solution space.

Large and complex surge analysis problems need extraordinarily powerful solution techniques. Design of surge protection systems is an iterative process and may require numerous productive analytical runs, possibly several dozens to a few hundred, before arriving at an effective and efficient protection system. A computational tool that takes 8 hours to complete one surge analysis run, for example, would unnecessarily delay the design process, likely forcing practitioners to either miss real-world project deadlines or to limit their analytical runs, which could compromise the effectiveness or the efficiency of the surge protection system, or both. On the other hand, a computational tool that is even an order of magnitude faster would help to arrive at an effective and optimal design in a reasonable timeframe. WPM is that tool, and its computational efficiency scales with the size and complexity of the system under consideration. It is easy to appreciate the advantages of a powerful solution technique that may be up to several orders of magnitude faster than existing alternatives without compromising the accuracy of the

results. **Chapter 2** describes the power of WPM when addressing large and complex surge analysis problems. The chapter describes the real-life challenges faced by water utilities, such as how to minimize the large number of water main breaks (currently around 180,000 per year in US and Canadian water distribution networks!), and ways to eliminate potential pathogen intrusion problems and the associated “boil water” advisories. Appendix B is a companion section to Chapter 2, providing an in-depth analysis of WPM and the competing Method of Characteristics (MOC), establishing the unequivocal superiority of WPM over MOC.

The objective of most surge analysis studies is to design an effective and optimal surge protection system. Some studies might be geared towards forensic investigation of pipeline or component failures. Regardless of the reason for surge analysis, a thorough understanding of the causes of pressure surges in pipeline systems is indispensable. **Chapter 3** illustrates a variety of scenarios that can generate pressure surges in pipeline systems. It is also important that modelers understand the most fundamental cause-and-effect relationship governing the occurrence of extreme surge pressures, which can be summarized by the statement, “rapid changes in velocities lead to rapid changes in pressures.” Modelers must therefore consider all possible scenarios that could generate a rapid change in velocity, instead of relying on a compiled list of example scenarios. Accordingly, the material presented in this chapter directs the readers to visualize how each of the scenarios presented generates rapid changes in velocities, an understanding which is generalizable when identifying causes of transients that are not explicitly listed in this chapter. The companion sections of this Chapter 3 are Appendix C: Attenuation of Pressure, Appendix D: Wave Speed, Appendix G: Pumps and Turbines, and Appendix H: Check Valves.

When surge pressures exceed the pressure ratings of pipelines or other devices within a pipeline system, they can produce acute or chronic damage, or both. **Chapter 4** illustrates the types of damage extreme surge pressures cause in pipeline systems by describing real-world incidents. The chapter also provides a brief introduction to determining the pressure-withstanding capacities of pipelines constructed of different materials.

**Chapter 5** illustrates various methods of protecting pipeline systems from extreme surge pressures. This includes summarizing the types of currently available surge protection devices, details of their working principles, and their relative advantages and disadvantages. Air valves as surge protection devices are described in Chapter 6. Chapter 5 shows how understanding and relying on the principle that “rapid changes in velocities result in rapid changes in pressures” assists with the selection of appropriate surge protection methods and devices. Inappropriately selected or sized surge protection devices can introduce secondary surge pressures that could be more severe than the primary surge pressures they are designed to mitigate. More information is contained within this chapter’s companion section, Appendix E: Air-water interface.

There has been significant progress in the last two decades in the design of air valves used in pipeline systems. While air valves are indispensable to most pipeline systems for filling and draining operations (including removal of residual air), these valves are often not designed or sized as surge protection devices. However, certain specially designed air valves, called non-slam air valves, have been used successfully to protect pipeline systems from extreme negative pressures while minimizing the slam pressures associated with rejoining water columns during air venting cycle. The cost of surge protection can be drastically reduced when air valves are incorporated as part of the surge protection design, where appropriate. When air valves are used as part of surge protection, they introduce air into the pipeline during unsteady state, and the presence of air violates the fundamental closed-conduit flow assumption that underpins both WPM and MOC. Therefore, it is important to understand the assumptions associated with air valve modeling so informed decisions can be made on the suitability of air valves as part of surge

protection system. **Chapter 6** describes the different types of air valves, including those used for surge protection, and how they are modeled by a popular WPM-based surge analysis tool. More information is available in this chapter's companion sections, Appendix E: Air-Water Interface and Appendix F: Air Valves and Common Misconceptions. Chapter 7: Assumptions and Uncertainties, contains a detailed review of a real-world scenario in which non-slam air valves are shown to be an essential component of an effective and efficient surge protection design by examining the increased cost and practical limitations of alternative designs.

All non-trivial modeling tasks must account for certain assumptions and uncertainties, and surge analysis is no exception. A few modelers are aware of all the assumptions and uncertainties, capable of interpreting the model results accordingly, and thus can build sufficient factors of safety into their surge protection designs. **Chapter 7** summarizes the assumptions associated with the available modeling techniques (WPM and MOC) and describes the assumptions made when modeling various components of the pipeline system. This chapter also describes the various sources of uncertainty involved when characterizing pipeline components, including the lack of manufacturer-provided specifications and the resultant use of generalized as opposed to component-specific data sets. Though the long list of assumptions and uncertainties might be somewhat discouraging to novice modelers, the authors are of the opinion that empowering modelers with the complete set of facts is the best teaching method, since these assumptions and uncertainties, if not properly accounted for, can invalidate the resultant surge protection design, regardless of which tool is used for modeling. Chapter 7 also describes the importance of sensitivity analysis to gain further confidence in model results and recommends adding factors of safety to the surge protection design where the uncertainties cannot otherwise be accounted for. The need for a powerful solution technique is self-evident when several dozens of productive model runs (driven by the need for extensive sensitivity analysis) are required to quantify the potential impact of these uncertainties on system surge pressures and thus arrive at an effective and optimal surge protection design.

When pressure waves are generated by any transient-initiating event, they travel through all hydraulically connected regions of the pipeline at sonic speeds. The wave mechanics described in Chapter 1 helps to visualize wave propagation as the waves traverse the entire pipeline system, being partially reflected and partially transmitted at junction nodes, components and other boundary conditions. These fast-moving pressure waves are also attenuated by the pipeline's frictional resistance. Whereas MOC-based numerical methods require division of long pipelines into uniform grids satisfying certain criteria, WPM can employ a nonuniform spatial grid to accurately account for the friction loss while maintaining the numerical stability. **Appendix A** describes the role of friction in the discretization of the solution space which is quantified through extensive numerical experiments. These experiments establish the ability of WPM to accurately assess the effects of friction in long pipelines, validating the use of the nonuniform spatial grid. These numerical experiments also illustrate the limits on the maximum grid spacing when selecting the non-uniform spatial grid.

**Appendix B** describes the basics of MOC and further elaborates on the information provided in Appendix A to establish the superiority of WPM over MOC. Specifically, the performance of first- and second order MOC are compared with the performance of WPM when addressing friction in longer pipe sections. Extensive numerical experiments originally presented in a doctoral thesis are provided to demonstrate the superiority of WPM over MOC.

There has been a considerable attention in recent literature to a phenomenon currently being referred to as "unsteady friction," which has been proposed to account for the faster-than-expected attenuation of pressure waves in certain laboratory-scale pipeline experiments. Unfortunately, no one has yet presented a reliable unsteady friction model that can be generalized to pipelines of different characteristics, even at

the experimental scale. **Appendix C** explores multiple possible reasons for the attenuation of pressure waves, allowing readers to make informed decisions regarding the necessity of accounting for unsteady friction when working with more complex, real-world pipeline systems.

A pressure wave generated in a pipeline system travels at sonic speed (called wave speed or celerity), the exact value of which depends on the characteristics of the transported fluid and the pipe structure bounding the fluid. Wave speed plays a dominant role in unsteady flow calculations. **Appendix D** describes the various factors influencing wave speeds in pipeline systems. Uncertainties surrounding the estimation of wave speeds for old, buried pipelines are discussed. This appendix also demonstrates the often-counter-intuitive effects of abrupt changes in wave speeds within pipelines of non-uniform diameters and/or materials (for example, a short, high-density polyethylene pipe with a low wave speed placed in the middle of a long, mild steel pipe with a higher wave speed).

**Appendix E** describes the air-water interface as it relates to surge analysis of pipeline systems. While there may be some pipeline systems that are completely free of air intrusion, the majority of pipelines must deal with the effects of air intrusion in some form. Air can be present in both the dissolved state and the suspended state. While the presence of large amounts of suspended (bulk) air violates the fundamental closed-conduit flow assumption underpinning both WPM and MOC, the presence of small quantities of suspended air can affect liquid density, bulk modulus, etc. Changes in the liquid density and bulk modulus affect wave speed and, in turn, the unsteady flow results. This appendix begins by describing the solubility of air in water, which affects the disappearance and reappearance of air bubbles and air pockets that can occur at different locations within the pipeline throughout unsteady state. Several other related topics such as vapor pressure, suspended vs. dissolved air, factors influencing the transport of air in pipelines, the polytropic process, corrosion, etc., are discussed as well. This appendix also describes several important factors that can generate either adverse or favorable effects arising from the presence of an air-water interface in isolated portions (such as dead ends) of pipeline systems.

**Appendix F** illustrates common misconceptions associated with air valves in pipeline systems. Many of these misconceptions result from the lack of unified standards on the design and use of air valves, and more importantly, the use of air valves for surge protection.

**Appendix G** describes the inertial characteristics of pumps and turbines. It describes the origins of “industry standard” nondimensional pump characteristics in the well-known Suter curves format, beginning with the collection of experimental data at Caltech in the early 1930s. The appendix discusses the transformation of this data, first presented in Karman-Knapp circle diagrams, through Donsky’s compilation of the same data into a format suitable for use with computational tools. The appendix also illustrates the operating ranges of both pumps and turbines within Suter curve diagrams. The dependability of the “industry standard” nondimensional characteristics generated using three laboratory-scale pumps of nearly century old designs for today’s pumps of diverse capacities is discussed.

**Appendix H** describes the operation of various types of check valves used in pipeline systems. It illustrates the complexity of check valve operation, and explains the difficulties associated with obtaining deterministic, time-dependent check valve closing characteristics. The appendix also demonstrates the workable solution of employing manufacturer-provided dynamic characteristic curves relating potential reverse velocity just before the final closing of the check valve to the flow deceleration at the check valve’s location, which can be used to validate check valve modeling assumptions.



## Conversion Factors:

---

1 ft = 0.3048m, 1m = 3.2808 ft = 39.37 in

1 mile = 1.609 km, 1 km = 0.6214 miles

1 lbm = 0.4536 kg, 1 kg = 2.2046 lbm = 0.06852 slug

1 oz = 28.3495 g, 1 g = 0.03527 oz

1 lbf = 4.448 N, 1 N = 0.2248 lbf

1 psi = 6.895 kPa = 0.06895 bar, 1 bar = 14.5038 psi

1 ft<sup>3</sup>/s = 0.0283 m<sup>3</sup>/s, 1000 l/s, 1 m<sup>3</sup>/s = 35.3147 ft<sup>3</sup>/s = 15852 gpm

Temperature:  $T_C (^{\circ}\text{C}) = (T_F (^{\circ}\text{F}) - 32) * (5/9)$ ,  $T_F (^{\circ}\text{F}) = (T_C (^{\circ}\text{C}) * (9/5)) + 32$

---



# APPENDIX I

## WPM Bibliography

- Don J. Wood and T.E. Stelson, "Energy Analysis of Pressure Surges in Closed Conduits," Development in Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Vol. 1, Pergamon Press, 1963, pp. 371-388.
- Don J. Wood, R. Dorsch and C. Lightner, "Digital Distributed Model for the Analysis of Unsteady Flow in Liquid Filled Lines," NASA TN D-2812, May 1965, 47 pages.
- Don J. Wood, R. Dorsch and C. Lightner, "Wave Analysis of Unsteady Flow in Conduits," Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, March 1966, Vol. 92, No. HY2, pp. 83-220.
- R. Dorsch, Don J. Wood, and C. Lightner, "Distributed Parameter Analysis of Pressure and Flow Perturbations in Rocket Propellant Feed System." NASA TN D-3529, August 1966, 53 pages.
- Don J. Wood, and T.Y. Kao, "Generation and Propagation of Pressure Waves in Two Phase Flow," Development in Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, Vol. 3, Pergamon Press, 1967, pp. 713-724.
- Don J. Wood and R. Dorsch, "The Effect of Propellant Feed System Coupling and Feed Systems Parameters on the Analysis of Chugging," NASA TN-2896, May 1967, 22 pages.
- Don J. Wood and T.Y. Kao, "Evaluation of the Quasi-Steady Approximation for Viscous Effects in Unsteady Liquid Pipe Flow," ASME Paper (No. 68-FE-33), 1967, 7 pages.
- Don J. Wood, "Calculation of Water Hammer Pressure Due to Valve Closure." Journal of the American Water Works Institution, November 1968, Vol. 60, No. 11, pp. 1301-1307.
- Don J. Wood, "A Study of the Response of Coupled Liquid Flow-Structural Systems Subjected to Periodic Disturbances," Journal of Basic Engineering ASME, Vol. 90, Series D, No. 4, December 1968, pp. 532-541.
- Don J. Wood, "Hydraulic Transient Analysis Employing Analog Techniques," Proceedings, 3rd Annual Workshop, American Association of Professors of Sanitary Engineering, 1968, pp. 78-95.
- Don J. Wood, "The Influence of Line Motion of Water Hammer Pressures." Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, May 1969, Vol. 95, No. HY3, pp. 941-961.
- Don J. Wood, "Lumped and Distributed Parameter Analog Analysis of Transient Liquid Pipe Flow," Applications, Analog/Hybrid Computer Educational Users Group, Vol. 4, No. E, June 1969.
- Don J. Wood, "Pressure Surge Attenuation Utilizing an Air Chamber," Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, Vol. 96, No. HY5, May 1970, pp. 1143-1156.
- Don J. Wood and S.P. Chao, "The Effect of Bends and Junctions on Water Hammer Surges," Transportation Engineering Journal, ASCE, Vol. 97, Note 3, Aug. 1971, pp. 441-457.
- S.E. Jones and D.J. Wood, "The Effect of Axial Boundary Motion on Pressure Surge Generation," ASME, Paper No. 71-WA/FE 14, Journal of Basic Engineering, Vol. 94, Series D., No. 2, June 1972, pp. 441-446.
- J.E. Funk, D.J. Wood and S.P. Chao, "The Transient Response of Orifices and Very Short Lines," ASME Paper No. 71-WA/FE 14, Journal of Basic Engineering, June 1972, Vol. 94, Series D., No. 2, pp. 483-491.
- Don J. Wood and S.E. Jones, "Water Hammer Charts for Various Types of Valves," Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, Vol. 99, No. HY1, Jan. 1973, pp. 167-178.

- S.E. Jones and D.J. Wood, "Prediction and Control of Pressure Surges Due to Valve Closure," Proceedings, International Conference on Pressure Surges, BHRA, England, 1973.
- S.E. Jones and D.J. Wood, "Pressure Surge Generation Due to Flow Shutdown," Proceedings, Society of Engineering Science, Oct.1975.
- Don J. Wood, "Simplified Modeling and Analysis of Fluid Transient Problems," Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mathematical Modeling, Vol. 111, 1977, pp. 1259-1268.
- T.Y. Kao and Don J. Wood, "Pressure Surge Generation Due to Rapid Shutdown of Pipelines Conveying Slurries," Proceedings, Hydrotransport V, BHRA Fluids Engineering, El, pp. 1-14, 1978.
- Don J. Wood, "Water Hammer Analysis in Pipe Systems," Proceedings, International Institute on Hydraulic Transients, July 1982, Sao Paulo, Brazil.
- A.R.D. Thorley and Don Wood, "Fault Analysis and Fluid Transients Suppression in Pipelines and Networks," Proceedings -International Conference on Computer Application for Water Supply and Distribution - 1987, Leicester, England, Sept. 1987.
- A.R.D. Thorley and Don J. Wood, "Fluid Transients, Fault Conditions and Hazard Assessments of Pipelines and Networks," Proceedings, 1st International Conference in Africa on Computer Methods and Water Resources, Rabat, Morocco, March 1988.
- Don J. Wood and James E. Funk, "Microcomputer Analysis of Transient Flow in Pipe Networks," Proceedings, International Symposium on Computer Modeling of Water Distribution Systems, Lexington, KY, May 1988.
- S.E. Jones and Don J. Wood, "An Exact Solution of the Water Hammer Problem in a Single Pipeline with Simulated Line Friction," ASME Conference Paper, Pressure Vessels and Piping Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, June 1988.
- D.J. Wood, J.E. Funk and P.F. Boulous, "Pipe Network Transients - Distributed and Lumped Parameter Modeling," Chapter 10, Proceedings, 6th International Conference on Pressure Surges, Cambridge, England, Oct. 1989, pp. 131-142.
- P.F. Boulous, D.J. Wood and J.E. Funk, "A Comparison of Numerical and Exact Solutions for Pressure Surge Analysis," Chapter 12, Proceedings, 6th International Conference on Pressure Surges, Cambridge, England, Oct. 1989, pp. 149-159.
- J.E. Funk, D.J. Wood and P.F. Boulous, "Transient Flow Computer Model Verification: Case Studies," Proceedings, 2nd International Conference, Computer Methods and Water Resources, 1991.
- Funk, J.E., Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S. and D.C. Denger, Pressure Surges due to Rapid Expulsion of Air, International Conference on Unsteady Flow and Fluid Transients, Sept-Oct 1992, Durham, England.
- D.J. Wood, J.E. Funk, and D. Thorley, "The Enhancement of Pressure Surge Models Through the Use of Graphics", Proceedings - International Conference Computer Applications for Water Supply and Distribution, DeMontfort University, Leicester, UK, Sept. 1993.
- Funk, J.E., S.J. VanVuuren, D.J. Wood, M. LeChevallier, and M. Friedman. 1999. Pathogen Intrusion into Water Distribution Systems Due to Transients. Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ASME/JSM E Joint Fluids Engineering Conference, July 18-22, San Francisco, CA.
- Wang H. (1997). The application of genetic algorithm in optimizing the closed surge tanks/air release/vacuum valves in pipeline system. MS Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Kentucky.
- Lingireddy, S., Funk, J.E., and Wang H (2000) Genetic Algorithms in Optimizing Transient Suppression Devices, Proceedings of the 2000 Joint Conference on Water Resource Engineering and Water Resources Planning and Management, ASCE, section 51, chapter 4.
- Gullick, R.W.; LeChevallier, M.W.; Svindland, R.C.; Friedman, M.; Wood, D.J.; & Funk, J.E. 2003. Field Verification of Transient Low and Negative Pressures in Potable Water Distribution Systems. American Water, Voorhees, NJ.
- Lingireddy, S., Wood, D.J., and Zloczower, N. (2004) Pressure Surges in Pipeline Systems Due to Air Release. Jl. American Water Works Association, 96 (7), 88-94
- Ramalingam, D. P., and Lingireddy, S., "Pathogen Intrusion into Water Distribution System due to Hydraulic Transients," Kentucky Water Resources Annual Symposium, Feb. 19, 2004, Lexington, KY.

- Friedman, M., L. Radder, S. Harrison, D. Howie, M. Britton, G. Boyd, H. Wang, R. Gullick, M. LeChevallier, D. Wood and J. Funk. 2004. Verification and Control of Pressure Transients and Intrusion in Distribution Systems. AWWA Research Foundation, Denver, CO.
- Wood, D.J., (2005) Water Hammer Analysis—Essential and Easy (and Efficient), J. of Environmental Engineering, ASCE, Vol 131, 8, 1123
- Boulos, P.F., Karney, B.W., Wood, D.J., and Lingireddy, S. Hydraulic Transient Guidelines for Design, Operation and Protection of Water Distribution Systems, J. American Water Works Association. May 2005.
- Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S., Boulos, P.F., Karney, B. W., and McPherson, D.L. Numerical Methods for Modeling Transient Flow in Water Distribution Systems, J. American Water Works Association. (July 2005)
- Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S., and Boulos, P.F., Pressure Wave Analysis of Transient Flow in Pipe Networks by, MWH Press, 2005
- Ramalingam, D. (2007) Design aids for air vessels for transient protection of large pipe networks - a framework based on parameterization of knowledgebase derived from optimized network models, A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College of Engineering at the University of Kentucky
- Lingireddy, S. and Raval, S. Importance of Air Management in Intermittent Water Distribution Systems, IWWA Conference on Achieving 24x7 Water Supply, India, 2008
- Lingireddy, S., Wood, D.J., and Raval, S. Water hammer and Pathogen Intrusion Studies on 24x7 Water Distribution Systems, IWWA Conference on Achieving 24x7 Water Supply, India, 2008
- Sathish K, Saran K, Raval, S., and Lingireddy, S. Role of Pump Inertia Values in Transient Analysis of Pipeline Systems, 3<sup>rd</sup> International Perspective on Current & Future State of Water Resources & the Environment, Environmental and Water Resources Institute of ASCE, January 2008.
- Ramalingam, D., and Lingireddy, S., and Wood, D.J. Computational Advantages of Wave Characteristic Method for Transient Analysis of Pipe Networks, J. AWWA, Feb 2009
- Raval, S. and Lingireddy, S. Water Loss Mitigation through Prevention of Extreme Sub-atmospheric Conditions, IWWA Journal, Special Issue, January 2009.
- Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S., and Boulos, P.F., Shock and Water Hammer Loading, Pressure Vessels and Piping Systems, Ed. Yong W. Kwon and Poh-Sang Lam. eBook and Print Libraries by EOLSS, 2009.
- Jung, B.S., Boulos, P.F, Wood, D.J. (2009) Effect of pressure-sensitive demand on surge analysis, Journal of American Water Works Association.
- Ramalingam, D. and Lingireddy, S. (2013). "Neural Network Derived Heuristic framework for Sizing Surge Vessels." J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage., 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000371 (Apr. 20, 2013).

# APPENDIX J

## References

- Bertaglia, G., Ioriatti, M., Valiani, A., Dumbser, M., and Caleffia, V. (2018) Numerical methods for hydraulic transients in visco-elastic pipes, *Jl. Fluids and Structures*, Elsevier, August, 81, pp 230-254.
- Boothe, P.M. and Lewis, C.K. (1932) Master's Thesis, Department of Civil Engineering, California Institute of Technology, June.
- Canada (2020) <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ecccc/documents/pdf/cesindicators/drinking-water-advisories/2020/drinking-water-advisories.pdf>
- Courant, R., Friedrichs, K., Lewy, H. (1928), Über die partiellen Differenzengleichungen der mathematischen Physik", *Mathematische Annalen* (in German), 100 (1): 32–74 (English translation: On the Partial Difference Equations of Mathematical Physics, *IBM Journal* March 1967)
- Donsky, B. (1961). "Complete pump characteristics and the effects of specific speed in hydraulic transients." *Journal of Basic Eng.*, ASME, Vol. 12, pp. 685-691.
- Erhard (2021) [https://www.erhard.de/en/products/categories/security-and-control-valves/non-return-valves/non-slam-nozzle-check-valve-edrv/?no\\_cache=1&tx\\_comatecdownloads\\_pi1%5Bid%5D=2850&tx\\_comatecdownloads\\_pi1%5Baction%5D=downloadFile&tx\\_comatecdownloads\\_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=Download](https://www.erhard.de/en/products/categories/security-and-control-valves/non-return-valves/non-slam-nozzle-check-valve-edrv/?no_cache=1&tx_comatecdownloads_pi1%5Bid%5D=2850&tx_comatecdownloads_pi1%5Baction%5D=downloadFile&tx_comatecdownloads_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=Download)
- Esleeck, S. H. and Rosser, R. M. (1959) Check valve water hammer characteristics, Technical Report, BAW-90-1 (NSA-14-025584), Babcock and Wilcox Co., Atomic Energy Div, Lynchburg, VA.
- Funk, J.E., S.J. VanVuuren, D.J. Wood, M. LeChevallier, and M. Friedman. (1999) Pathogen Intrusion into Water Distribution Systems Due to Transients. Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ASME/JSME Joint Fluids Engineering Conference, July 18-22, San Francisco, CA.
- Funk, J.E., Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S. and D.C. Denger, (1992) Pressure Surges due to Rapid Expulsion of Air, International Conference on Unsteady Flow and Fluid Transients, Sept-Oct 1992, Durham, England.
- Ghidaoui, M., Zhao, M., McInnis, D., and Axworthy, D (2005) A Review of Water Hammer Theory and Practice, *Applied Mechanics Reviews*, ASME, 58, 49-76.
- Gullick, R.W; LeChevallier, M.W.; Svindland, R.C.; Friedman, M.; Wood, D.J.; & Funk, J.E. (2003) Field Verification of Transient Low and Negative Pressures in Potable Water Distribution Systems. American Water, Voorhees, NJ.
- Haynes and Sauermann (1933) Master's Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, June.
- Helton, J. C.; Johnson, J. D.; Salaberry, C. J.; Storlie, C. B. (2006). "Survey of sampling based methods for uncertainty and sensitivity analysis". *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*. 91 (10–11): 1175–1209.
- HI (1998), American National Standard for Pump Intake Design, Hydraulic Institute, ANSI/HI-1998, American National Standards Institute, Inc. pp 62.
- JFPA (2012) Oil Hydraulics-Handbook, pp.252-254, The Japan Fluid Power Association.
- Joukowski, N. (1904) "On the hydraulic hammer in water supply pipes," (translation of original 1898 publication in German by O Simin), *Proceedings American Water Works Association (AWWA)*, 24, 341-424

- Jung, B.S., Boulos, P.F, Wood, D.J. (2009) Effect of pressure-sensitive demand on surge analysis, Journal of American Water Works Association. April, Vol 101(4), 100-111.
- Karim, M., (2003) Abbaszadegan, M., and Lechevallier, M., Potential for pathogen intrusion during pressure transient, J. AWWA, May, Vol 95(5), 134-146.
- Kipping, W. (2001) Slanted seat swing check valves with internal cushioning system "VAG SKR", VAG-Armaturen GmbH.
- Kittredge, C.P. and Thoma, D. (1931) Centrifugal Pumps Operated under Abnormal Conditions, Power, 73, pp 881-884 (English translation of original article in German published in 1931)
- Klaus E. E. and O'Brien J. A., (1964) Precise Measurement and Prediction of Bulk-Modulus Values for Fluids and Lubricants, ASME Journal of Basic Engineering, pp.469-473.
- Knapp, R.T. (1937) Complete Characteristics. of Centrifugal Pumps and Their Use in the Prediction of Transient Behavior, Transactions of ASME, pp 683-689.
- Kruisbrink, A.C.H. (1996) The dynamic behavior of check valves in pipeline systems, A Thesis submitted to City University London for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Mechanical Engineering.
- Li, G. and Liou, J.C. (2003) Swing Check Valve Characterization and Modeling During Transients, Journal of Fluid Engineering, ASME, November, 125, pp 1043-1050.
- Lingireddy, S. and Elango, K., (1989) Analysis of water distribution networks with head dependent outlets, Civil Engineering Systems, Vol. 6 No.3, 102-110.
- Lingireddy, S. (1991) Analysis and Design of Pipe Networks with Head-dependent Outflows, a thesis submitted to Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India, for the award of Ph.D. degree in Civil Engineering.
- Lingireddy, S. and Elango, K., (1991) A New method to the Analysis of Water Starved Networks, Jl. of Indian Water Works Association, Vol.23, No.1, 31-38.
- Lingireddy, S. and Elango, K., (1992) Optimal Design of Water Distribution Networks with Head Dependent Outflows using Augmented Lagrangian functions, Journal of Institution of Engineers (INDIA), Environmental Engg. Div., Vol.73, Pt EN 2, Oct., 27-33.
- Lingireddy, S., and Ormsbee, L.E., (1998) "Neural Networks in Optimal Calibration of Water Distribution Systems," Artificial Neural Networks for Civil Engineers: Advanced Features and Applications. Ed. I. Flood, and N. Kartam. American Society of Civil Engineers, 1998, p277.
- Lingireddy, S. and Wood, D.J. (1998) Improved Operation of Water Distribution Systems using Variable Speed Pumps, Jl. of Energy Engineering, ASCE, Vol. 124, 3
- Lingireddy, S., Funk, J.E., and Wang, Hongbing (2000) Genetic Algorithms in Optimizing Transient Suppression Devices, Proceedings of the 2000 Joint Conference on Water Resource Engineering and Water Resources Planning and Management, ASCE, section 51.
- Lingireddy, S., and Ormsbee, L.E., (2002) "Hydraulic Network Calibration using Genetic Optimization," Civil and Environmental Engineering Systems, 19(1), 13-39
- Lingireddy, S., Wood, D.J., and Zloczower, N. (2004) Pressure Surges in Pipeline Systems Due to Air Release. Jl. American Water Works Association, 96 (7), 88-94
- Lingireddy, S., Ormsbee, L.E., Wood, D.J., (2005) "Calibration of Hydraulic Network Models," Encyclopedia of Water, Ed. Jay Lehr, John Wiley & Sons
- Lingireddy, S., Wood, D.J., and Raval, S. (2008) Water hammer and Pathogen Intrusion Studies on 24x7 Water Distribution Systems, IWWA Conference on Achieving 24x7 Water Supply
- Lingireddy, S., Wood, D.J., and Zloczower, N. (2013) Air Valves as Surge Control Devices Challenges associated with Transient Modeling, The First International Hydraulic Surge and Air Control Symposium, Kfar Haruv, Israel, April 9 and 10, 2013

- Liou, C.P. and Hunt, W.A. (1996) Filling of Pipelines with Undulating Elevation Profiles, *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, ASCE, October, 122 (10), pp 534-539.
- Mead, D.W. (1896) "The hydraulic ram, for use in public water systems", Annual report of the Illinois Society of Engineers and Surveyors, 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Report, 50-64 (1896)).
- Mead, D.W. (1901) "Large Hydraulic Ram". *The Engineering Record*, Vol. 44: Building Record and the Sanitary Engineer, No. 8, 174, New York: July-Dec 1901
- Montgolfier, J.M. (1803). "Note sur le b  lier hydraulique, et sur la mani  re d'en calculer les effets" [Note on the hydraulic ram, and on the method of calculating its effects]. *Journal des Mines*, 13 (73) (in French). pp. 42–51).
- Murphy, K. (2004) Are Nitrogen Molecules Really Larger Than Oxygen Molecules? The correct answer, with respect to "permeation", is yes. <https://www.getnitrogen.org/pdf/graham.pdf>
- Ormsbee, L.E. and Lingireddy, S. (1997) Calibrating Hydraulic Network Models, *Journal American Water Works Association*, 89(2), 42-50.
- Ormsbee, L.E., and Lingireddy, S. (1999) "Chapter 14 - Model Calibration," *Water Distribution System Handbook*, Ed. L. W. Mays, McGraw-Hill Press, 1999.
- Parmakian, J., (1963) "Water Hammer Analysis", Dover Publications, Inc, New York.
- Provoost, G.A. (1980) The Dynamic Behavior of Non-return Valves, *Proc. 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conf. on Pressure Surges*, BHRA, pp 415-428
- Ramalingam, D. (2007) Design aids for air vessels for transient protection of large pipe networks - a framework based on parameterization of knowledgebase derived from optimized network models, A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in College of Engineering at the University of Kentucky.
- Ramalingam, D. P., and Lingireddy, S., (2004) "Pathogen Intrusion into Water Distribution System due to Hydraulic Transients," *Kentucky Water Resources Annual Symposium*, Feb. 19, 2004, Lexington, KY.
- Ramalingam, D., Lingireddy, S., Ormsbee, L.E., (2002) History of Water Distribution Network Analysis Late 19<sup>th</sup> Century through the Advent of Digital Computers, *ASCE National Meeting*, Washington D.C. November
- Ramalingam, D., and Lingireddy, S., and Wood, D.J. (2009) Computational Advantages of Wave Characteristic Method for Transient Analysis of Pipe Networks, *Jl. AWWA*, Feb
- Ramalingam, D. and Lingireddy, S. (2013). "Neural Network Derived Heuristic framework for Sizing Surge Vessels." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000371 (Apr. 20, 2013).
- Saisanket (2016) Tirupati – Repairs, Renovation, and Rehabilitation of the existing water supply scheme with Saiganga as source, A report submitted to the Public Health and Municipal Engineering Department, Govt. of AP, India.
- Smeltz, A. (2019) - <https://www.post-gazette.com/local/city/2019/01/20/Water-main-breaks-Pittsburgh-Water-Sewer-Authority-PWSA-Penn-American/stories/201901170118>).
- Streeter, V.L. and Wiley, E.B. (1967) *Hydraulic Transients*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Suter, P. (1966). "Representation of pump characteristics for calculation of water hammer." *Sulzer Technical Review*, Vol. 66, pp.45-48.
- Svindland, R. (2005) "Predicting the Location and Duration of Transient Induced Low or Negative Pressures Within a Large Water Distribution System," A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Civil Engineering, College of Engineering at the University of Kentucky.
- Swanson, W.M. (1951) Complete Characteristic Circle Diagrams for Turbomachinery, In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of mechanical engineer, California Institute of Technology.
- Szymkiewicz, R. and Mitosek, M. (2014) Alternative Convolution Approach to Friction in Unsteady Pipe Flow, *Journal of Fluid Engineering*, ASME, January, 136

- Thorley, A.R.D. (1991). Fluid Transients in Pipeline Systems. D. & L. George Ltd Publ., Herts, UK.
- Turpin, J.B. (2004) Variable Step Integration Coupled with the Method of Characteristics Solution for Water-Hammer Analysis, A Case Study, 52<sup>nd</sup> Joint Army Navy NASA Air Force Propulsion Meeting, Las Vegas.
- ValMatic (2021) <https://www.valmatic.com/Portals/0/pdfs/DesignSelectionCheckValves.pdf>
- Van Vuuren, S.J., Van Dijk, M. and Steenkamp J.N. (2004). Quantifying the influence of air on the capacity of large diameter water pipelines and developing provisional guidelines for effective de-aeration. Volumes 1 & 2. WRC report no. 1177/1/04. Water Research Commission. Pretoria, South Africa.
- Vardy , A.E. and Tijsseling, A.S. (2015) Method of characteristics: (Why) is it so good? BHR Group 2015 Pressure Surges 12.
- Wang H. (1997). The application of genetic algorithm in optimizing the closed surge tanks/air release/vacuum valves in pipeline system. MS Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Kentucky.
- Whitehurst, J. (1772) 1775 XXIV. Account of a machine for raising water, executed at Oulton, in Cheshire, in 1772. In a letter from Mr. John Whitehurst to Dr. Franklin. Philosophical Trans. Of the Royal. Soc. 65277-279 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstl.1775.0026>
- Wood, F.M. (1970) History of Water Hammer, C.E. Research Report N0. 65, April, Department of Civil Engineering, Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario.
- Wood, D.J. and Jones, S.E. (1973) "Water Hammer Charts for Various Types of Valves," Journal of Hydraulics Division, ASCE, Vol. 99, No. HY1, Jan. 1973, pp. 167-178.
- Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S., and Boulos, P.F., (2005) Pressure Wave Analysis of Transient Flow in Pipe Networks by, MWH Press
- Wood, D.J., Lingireddy, S., and Boulos, P.F., (2009) Shock and Water Hammer Loading, Pressure Vessels and Piping Systems, Ed. Yong W. Kwon and Poh-Sang Lam. eBook and Print Libraries by EOLSS.
- Wylie, E.B., and Streeter V.L. (1993). Fluid transients in systems, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Wylie, E.B. (1996) Unsteady internal flows-Dimensionless numbers and time constants, 7th International Conference on Pressure Surges and Transients in Pipelines and Open Channels, BHR Group, Harrogate, UK, 16-18 April, 283-288.

# Index

Absorption, 208  
Actuated, 93, 94, 274, 277, 278  
Affinity laws, 54, 251, 254  
Air entrainment, 121, 132, 140, 215, 219, 220, 221  
Altitude, 51, 97, 230, 231  
Ambient, 224, 230, 231, 241  
Amplitude, 5, 6, 211  
Anchored, 213, 216  
Aqueducts, 71  
Armature coil, 254  
Aviation, 231  
Backflow, 102, 271, 274  
Bench-scale, 150  
BFP, 271  
Biofilm, 208, 217  
Bituminous, 239  
Bladders, 83, 99, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116  
Block, 90, 122, 123, 208, 241  
Boiling, 230, 231, 232  
Bounded, 18, 211, 212  
Brake power, 255  
Buckling, 70, 72, 74  
Bulging, 70  
Buoyancy, 122, 124, 234, 235  
Buried, 72, 152, 213, 216, 217, 245  
Butyl, 111, 112  
Bypass lines, 272  
Calibrate, 40, 194  
Calibration, 208, 217  
Casing, 74  
Catastrophic, 69, 72, 76, 104, 141, 228, 243  
Caving, 72  
Cavitation, 82, 87, 95, 118, 228, 232, 241  
Cavities, 50, 56, 95, 122, 143, 241, 244  
Chambers, 35, 87, 89, 93, 245  
Chatter, 51, 140  
Choked, 130, 131, 244  
Choking, 130  
Circumference, 15, 282  
Circumferential, 65  
Clog, 90, 126  
Clunks, 59  
Coalesce, 220, 234  
Coalescing, 208, 234  
Coarser, 150, 191  
Coating, 112, 239  
Drained, 51, 56, 98, 99, 103, 109, 120, 121, 148  
Collapsed, 63, 74  
Collapses, 135  
Collated, 1  
Collide, 129  
Combustion, 56  
Commissioning, 51  
Compacted, 213  
Compaction, 216  
Compatible, 172, 175, 178  
Composite, 215, 289  
Compressibility, 7, 14, 17, 36, 39, 233  
Computational efficiency, 43, 44, 45, 46, 141, 156, 189  
Condense, 232  
Conduction, 43  
Constraint, 114, 157, 159, 188, 242, 243  
Contaminate, 244, 245  
Contamination, 120, 243, 245, 271  
Contraction, 212, 238  
Convergence, 42  
Convolution, 193  
Counterweights, 280, 283, 289  
Dalton's, 223  
Dampened, 138, 288  
Dampens, 217  
Damping, 218, 274  
Darcy-weisbach, 25, 26, 27, 150, 172, 182, 193, 195, 217  
Decelerate, 50, 56, 127, 257, 284, 285  
Decelerating, 10, 228  
Deformation, 76, 77, 212, 216  
Deformed, 214  
Delay, 121, 135, 147, 241, 242, 244  
Deluge, 229  
Destabilize, 42, 76  
Diaphragm, 89, 90, 136  
Discretization, 46, 141, 159, 165, 191  
Discretize, 3, 29, 53, 54, 149  
Dissipate, 14, 18, 81  
Dissipation, 238, 257, 260  
Dissolution, 106, 108, 112, 226, 238  
Dissolves, 106, 110, 120, 121  
Dissolving, 98, 99, 115, 226, 227  
Disturbance, 212  
Divergent, 165  
Diversion, 81  
Donsky, 261  
Drains, 2, 3, 90, 102



Drilled, 96  
Ductile iron, 69, 80, 87, 121, 205, 206, 213, 214,  
215, 245  
Duty pumps, 56  
Dynamics, 47, 238, 284  
Economical, 70, 121  
Eddies, 281  
Elbows, 76, 105  
Electrical, 55, 94, 274, 277, 278  
Electrochemical, 239  
Electromechanical, 80  
Elongation, 7, 14, 15  
Encrustation, 208, 217  
Energize, 254, 277  
Energizing, 106, 250, 255, 265  
Entrapped, 97, 119, 139, 244  
Entropy, 238  
Epoxy, 239  
Ethanol, 211  
Expanded, 98, 113, 192  
Expanding, 97  
Expands, 36, 85, 212  
Expelled, 127, 129, 136, 236  
Expelling, 243  
Experiments, 44, 150, 165, 185, 187, 192, 261  
Explicit, 28, 40, 174, 177, 178  
Exponent, 26, 28, 191, 209, 238  
Extrapolated, 24  
Fabricated, 69, 80, 155  
Fatigue, 76  
Fixed demands, 151  
Flatter terrain, 80, 99, 121  
Floating, 45, 232, 242, 275, 281  
Flops, 45  
Fluctuate, 4, 34, 138, 207  
Fluctuating, 76, 191  
Fluctuation, 5, 6, 7, 138, 201, 278  
Flywheels, 55  
Forensic, 74, 155, 220  
Francis, 265  
Freestanding, 223, 224  
Frequency, 51, 76, 192, 221  
Frictionless, 25, 249  
Gasoline, 230, 231  
Genetic algorithms, 45  
Gluing, 241, 244  
Gravity mains, 83, 236  
Groundwater, 43, 76, 189, 245  
GRP, 77, 215  
Guide vane, 267, 268, 270  
Guitar, 211

Hairline cracks, 77  
Harmonic, 221  
Hazen-william, 26, 27, 159, 217  
HDPE, 18, 69, 167, 213, 214  
Header, 228, 229, 271  
Heat capacity, 238  
Heat loss, 231  
Henry's, 223  
Hollander, 261  
HOPD, 277  
Hormonic, 222  
Hybrid surge tanks, 99, 115, 116, 118, 121  
Hydrants, 63, 64  
Hydrodynamic, 278  
Hydroelectric, 37, 96  
Hydropower, 37  
Hydrostatic, 155, 225  
Hyperbolic, 172, 175, 255  
Ic engines, 56  
Imbalance, 12, 250, 257  
Impulse turbine, 265  
Impurities, 215  
Incompressible, 17, 18  
Inflated, 111, 112  
Ingress, 241, 243  
Injecting, 226  
Instabilities, 40, 42, 43, 44, 177, 184, 188, 191  
Instability, 46, 72, 191  
Integral, 63, 119, 178  
Integrate, 31, 133, 173  
Integration, 136, 178  
Interference, 51  
Interpolation, 150, 182, 185, 269, 270, 287  
Intruded, 233  
Intrusion, 40, 42, 64, 120, 141, 146, 192, 233,  
236, 245  
Inward, 70, 72, 77, 119, 241  
Irrigation, 37, 42, 167, 188  
Isentropic, 131, 238  
Isolate, 24, 31, 104, 109, 110, 114  
Jammed, 242  
Kaplan, 265  
Karman, 151, 258, 262, 264, 266  
Kerosene, 231  
Kinematic, 57, 63  
Lawsuits, 64  
Layer, 193, 224, 225  
Leakages, 42, 69  
Lifts, 36, 122, 123  
Limiting, 54, 79, 81, 99, 119, 159, 272  
Lining, 42, 76, 215, 217, 239

Link, 69, 77, 81  
 Loadcell, 115  
 Loading, 286  
 Localize, 69, 77, 208, 243  
 Longevity, 112, 244  
 Looped, 37, 175  
 Lubricated, 281  
 Lumped, 195  
 Machinery, 258, 261  
 Machines, 220, 249, 251  
 Magnify, 165  
 Magnitudes, 25, 31, 134, 162, 178, 257  
 Manifold, 120  
 Manufactured, 69, 104, 184  
 Margin, 86, 157, 209  
 Measurement, 108, 116, 254  
 Measuring, 110  
 Mechanics, 39, 81, 142, 171  
 Mechanisms, 65, 126, 147, 242  
 Median, 213  
 Mineral, 90, 126, 152  
 Minimizing, 1, 271, 274, 278  
 Mitigate, 87, 93, 94, 95, 105, 243  
 Mitigation, 46, 52, 105  
 Mitral, 274  
 Mixture, 215, 219, 223  
 Modular, 110, 208  
 Moduli, 17, 214, 215  
 Moisture, 224, 239  
 Molecular, 224, 225  
 Moments, 80, 247, 248, 274, 280  
 Monitor, 42, 108, 109, 112, 115, 136, 150, 206, 209  
 Monitored, 206  
 Monitoring, 42, 108, 109, 112, 115, 136, 150, 209  
 Mortar, 76, 215, 217, 239  
 Mounting, 104, 115  
 Nail, 36  
 Nameplate, 255  
 Networked, 208  
 Newton, 28, 209, 247, 279  
 Nitrile, 111  
 Nitrogen, 112, 114, 223, 224  
 Nuclear, 37, 42, 188  
 Nylon, 87  
 One-way surge tanks, 83, 96, 100, 110, 121, 148, 271  
 Optimal, 45, 83, 108, 140, 144, 157, 159  
 Optimize, 79  
 Overburden, 70  
 Overflow, 96, 97, 102, 104  
 Oxidation, 239  
 Parmakian, 212  
 Pathogen, 40, 42, 64, 141, 192, 245  
 Pathways, 40, 42, 119, 120, 220, 223  
 Peak demand, 42, 76  
 Pelton, 265  
 Penstock, 37, 265  
 Percolate, 77  
 Perforated, 111  
 Permeability, 112  
 Perpetual, 34  
 Pilots, 93, 118, 277  
 Piston, 34, 87, 90, 91, 93  
 Pitting, 87  
 Pivots, 274  
 Plastic, 77, 215  
 Plumbing, 64  
 Plunging jets, 120  
 Pneumatic, 274, 277, 278  
 Poisson's ratio, 72, 212, 213, 214, 216  
 Polyethylene, 18, 69, 167, 214  
 Polytropic, 130, 131, 151, 220, 238  
 Polyvinyl, 167, 214  
 Portable, 114  
 Potable, 42, 73, 76, 128, 243  
 Powerpack, 277, 278  
 Premature, 51, 121, 123, 242, 243  
 Pressure-sensitive demands, 151  
 Prestressed, 77, 81  
 Primed, 115  
 Priming, 109, 116  
 Protecting, 1, 50, 79, 100, 104, 105, 117, 119, 121  
 Protective, 112  
 Protects, 95, 97  
 Protrusions, 112  
 PSC, 77  
 Pulmonic, 274  
 Pump control valve, 274, 277, 278  
 Pump startup, 49, 50, 51, 55, 251, 252, 253, 279  
 PVC, 72, 167, 168, 213, 214  
 Quadrants, 151, 262, 268, 269  
 Quasi steady state, 69  
 Radially, 212, 213, 255  
 Radical, 16, 17  
 Random, 224, 225, 226, 229, 232  
 Ratchet, 257  
 Reaction, 242, 265, 279  
 Reacts, 93  
 Refilling, 56  
 Reflecting, 23  
 Reflux, 150, 271

Regime, 193, 257  
Regimes, 257  
Regulate, 35, 42, 55  
Reinforced, 77, 112, 215  
Reinforcement, 115  
Rejoining, 58, 82, 232, 242, 244  
Relative humidity, 224, 239  
Relieve, 92, 95, 97, 98, 121  
Relieving, 94  
Relocation, 52  
Remedial, 74  
Repeatability, 150  
Repeatable, 199, 209  
Repeating, 184, 282  
Replenished, 98, 99, 106, 121  
Replenishing, 106, 108, 112, 116  
Replenishment, 99, 110, 112, 114, 238  
Reservoirs, 22, 30, 31, 81, 149, 172, 206  
Resilient, 77  
Resistive, 248, 249, 250, 251, 266  
Restarting, 51, 103, 110, 115, 148, 243  
Restrained, 17, 146, 213  
Restraint coefficient, 212, 213, 214, 216  
Restrains, 212  
Resultant, 194  
Retard, 121, 257  
Reversible, 238  
Reversing, 51, 59, 61  
Revolutions, 253  
Reynolds, 26, 193, 196, 199  
Rigid, 18, 211, 212, 213  
Risk, 143, 243  
Rodents, 245  
Rolling-seal, 126  
Roman, 71  
Rotate, 65, 249, 250, 279, 280  
Rotor, 249  
Rounded, 196  
Runaway, 250  
Ruptured, 75, 115  
Ruptures, 64, 76, 77, 115  
Saturated, 225, 226  
SDO, 30  
Sealed, 225, 232  
Sealing, 116, 242, 244  
Seals, 241, 242  
Seamless, 32, 40  
Seams, 115  
Sediment, 104, 112  
Seismic, 211  
Sensors, 110, 277

Sewage, 42, 112, 120, 121  
Sewer, 74  
Shear, 43, 193, 234  
Shock, 35  
Shutdown, 51, 55, 59, 80, 251, 252, 271  
Shutoff, 103  
Side discharge orifice, 30, 31, 137  
Silt, 120  
Singularities, 261  
Skin friction, 25  
Slams, 289  
Solenoid, 94, 277, 278  
Solute, 113, 131, 223  
Spatially, 39, 174  
Spikes, 56, 57, 61, 62, 170  
Spillage, 127  
Spilling, 42, 72  
Springs, 276, 278, 283, 285, 289  
Sprinkler, 228  
Stabilized, 5, 51, 238  
Stabilizing, 5, 8, 228  
Standpipe, 83, 96, 121  
Starter, 55  
Stiffness, 86, 87, 90  
Stochastic, 208  
Streamlines, 280, 285  
Strengthen, 79, 115, 177  
Stretch, 77, 137, 138  
Stride, 188  
String, 175, 211  
Structural, 51, 96, 120  
Structure, 42, 96, 97, 182, 212  
Strumming, 211  
Sturdiness, 87  
Submerged, 279, 280, 282, 283, 286  
Submergence, 120  
Succession, 132  
Successive, 221  
Suction, 2, 120  
Sulfates, 239  
Superimposed, 32  
Superimposition, 33  
Superposition, 208  
Suppressing, 80, 143, 147  
Suppression, 52  
Sustain, 10, 11, 51, 77, 132, 239, 266  
Swinging, 102, 274  
Switching, 136  
Switchover, 51  
Symptom, 80  
Tangential, 70

Tapping, 33, 34, 90  
Tear, 112  
Tensile, 15, 72, 155  
Tension, 71, 137, 211  
Terracotta, 71  
Thermodynamic, 238  
Threshold, 90, 99, 122, 130, 136, 146, 147, 280  
Throttling, 8, 14, 18, 51, 54, 56, 65, 268  
Thrust, 76  
Tilting, 274, 285  
Tolerance, 108, 217  
Toppled, 75  
Toxic, 95  
Transverse, 212  
Tricuspid, 274  
Tripped, 55, 115, 151, 247, 257, 266, 285  
Tuberculation, 217  
Tunnels, 74, 214  
Turbomachines, 249, 251  
Turbulent, 281

Undampened, 288  
Unrestrained, 213  
Vanes, 268  
Vaporizing, 69  
Vectors, 193  
Ventricle, 274  
Vessels, 114, 116, 120, 144  
Vibration, 55, 87, 211  
Viscosity, 152  
Volatile, 46, 231  
Voltage, 55  
Vortex, 120  
Watt, 74, 255  
Weighing, 193  
Weights, 125, 247, 254, 280, 283, 289  
Welded, 42, 69, 76, 112, 213  
Wicket gate, 37  
Wood stave, 71  
Yield strength, 72, 155

