



HAL
open science

Experimental modelling of urban flooding: A review

Emmanuel Mignot, Xuefang Li, Benjamin J. Dewals

► **To cite this version:**

Emmanuel Mignot, Xuefang Li, Benjamin J. Dewals. Experimental modelling of urban flooding: A review. *Journal of Hydrology*, 2019, 568, pp.334-342. 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.11.001 . hal-02381264

HAL Id: hal-02381264

<https://hal.science/hal-02381264>

Submitted on 29 Nov 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Experimental modelling of urban flooding: a review

Emmanuel Mignot^{a*}, Xuefang Li^b, Benjamin Dewals^b

^a University of Lyon, INSA Lyon, CNRS, LMFA UMR5509, F-69621 Villeurbanne, France

^b Hydraulics in Environmental and Civil Engineering (HECE), University of Liège (Uliège), Belgium

* Corresponding author: Emmanuel.mignot@insa-lyon.fr

Abstract

We review the 45 available studies of urban flooding based on laboratory experiments. We distinguish between the studies focusing on the flow in (i) a single street intersection, (ii) surface-sewer exchanges, (iii) an array of obstacles and (iv) quasi-realistic urban districts. We discuss the main flow processes which are covered in the various studies and detail which flow variables were recorded. This enables identifying flow processes for which comprehensive experimental datasets are available from those which require additional experimental research. We also highlight the typical ranges of scale factors used, which depend mainly on the extent of the studied area (from very local up to the district level). This review aims at helping computational modellers to pinpoint the most suitable dataset for validating their numerical approaches and laboratory modellers to identify gaps in current experimental knowledge of urban flooding.

Keywords: urban flood; experimental models; databases; flow processes; model set-ups.

1. Introduction

Among all natural disasters, floods are the most frequent and they affect the highest number of people globally (UNISDR, 2015). Flood risk is particularly severe in urban areas (Chen et al., 2015). Improving urban flood risk management has become a high priority at virtually all levels of governance (Fang, 2016). The proper design and evaluation of measures to enhance urban flood-resilience should be based on the analysis of a range of scenarios, in which various hydro-meteorological conditions and management options are tested. This requires the accurate modelling of inundation extents, water depths, discharge partition and flow velocity in urbanized flood prone areas, since these parameters are critical inputs for flood impact modelling (Kreibich et al., 2014).

28 For relatively rural areas, flood modelling and inundation mapping have become common practice
29 (Falconer et al., 2017; Teng et al., 2017). Based on the 1D or 2D shallow-water equations (SWE), the
30 accuracy of these computations depends mainly on the quality of hydrological and topographic input
31 data (Dottori et al., 2013). In contrast, floods in urban areas exhibit more diverse and complex flow
32 processes, as the water follows multiple flow paths such as crossroads, sewers, courtyards, parks, flow
33 around or within buildings and pieces of urban furniture (Paquier et al., 2015; Falconer et al., 2017).
34 Numerical models used for urban flood simulations need to account for these specific features of the
35 urban environment. For about two decades, the quality and complexity of urban flood simulations
36 have steadily increased. Starting from standard 1D or 2D models (Mark et al., 2004; Mignot et al.,
37 2006a), more sophisticated numerical approaches have become gradually available:

- 38 • additional processes were included in the models, such as the rain falling directly on the street
39 network (Pons et al., 2005; Paquier and Bazin, 2014), short waves or tsunami long waves
40 invading a city (Park et al., 2013), human evacuation during a flood (Bernardini et al., 2017),
41 among others;
- 42 • high resolution digital elevation models (DEM), such as laser altimetry with a resolution as
43 fine as 0.5 m in some urban areas (Van Ootegem et al., 2016), have enabled super precise
44 descriptions of the urban domains (Ozdemir et al., 2013);
- 45 • isotropic and anisotropic porosity-based models (e.g., Bruwier et al. (2017)), coupled 1D (in
46 streets) and 2D (in crossroads) models (Ghostine et al., 2015), as well as improved
47 computational techniques such as cloud computing (Glenis et al., 2013) or model
48 implementation on graphical processing unit (Apel et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2015), have been
49 developed to enable efficient coverage of large spatial areas;
- 50 • although still in its infancy, modelling the interactions between surface flow and the sewer
51 system has been tested, based on a 1D description of the underground system and 0D, 1D or
52 2D approaches for surface flow, each with scientific challenges (Leandro et al., 2009; Seyoum
53 et al., 2012; Bazin et al., 2014).

54 Nonetheless, further numerical developments are needed to incorporate more details (urban furniture,
55 street profiles, façade misalignments, parked cars) as well as additional processes generally
56 overlooked so far (water entering the buildings, more realistic interactions river/surface/sewers,
57 transport of cars, pollutants, computing rescue operations ...). Since 3D computations (Ghostine et al.,
58 2009; Gems et al., 2016; Rodi, 2017) will not be a viable option for operational flood analysis and
59 mapping in the coming years, many processes will not be captured explicitly by operational flood
60 models. They will have to be reproduced through appropriate analytical-empirical parametrizations.
61 The development and validation of these parametrization requires high quality and reliable reference
62 data.

63 Field data, such as watermarks and aerial imagery, remain generally scarce, uncertain and insufficient
64 to reflect the whole complexity of inundation flows in urbanized flood-prone areas, particularly under
65 more extreme future conditions (Neal et al., 2009). Additional information on the velocity fields and
66 discharge partitions are necessary to understand the multi-directional flow pathways induced by the
67 built-up network of streets, buildings and underground systems (e.g., drainage network). There is also
68 a lack of observations of pluvial urban floods, mainly due to the short duration and local nature of
69 intense rainfall events. To address this lack of validation data from the field, laboratory models are an
70 appealing alternative, since they provide accurate measurements of flow characteristics under
71 controlled conditions.

72 Therefore, this paper aims at reviewing the existing datasets of urban flood laboratory experiments.
73 This review may benefit to both numerical modellers willing to test and validate innovative
74 computational approaches, and experimentalists looking for comparison datasets or willing to close
75 knowledge gaps. The paper presents also an inventory of the flow processes for which experimental
76 research was undertaken or still to be handled. Field data are excluded on purpose, as they are
77 generally sparser and more uncertain.

78 The paper is organized in three parts. The existing experimental datasets dedicated to the analysis of
79 urban flood processes are reviewed in Sect. 2. In Sect. 3, the coverage of the main urban flood process
80 by dedicated laboratory experiments is evaluated; enabling us to point out the flow processes for

81 which no or limited experimental data are currently available. Finally, Sect. 4 links the main findings
82 to the corresponding numerical approaches, highlighting those which lack validation data. Hints for
83 future experimental research are proposed.

84

85 **2. State of the art of available urban flood datasets**

86 Table 1 lists the available experimental datasets related to urban flooding. Most experiments were
87 performed in the last 15 years, suggesting a growing worldwide interest for urban flood laboratory
88 data, as the corresponding numerical models also improved considerably. The experimental studies
89 focused on four main flow types: *(i)* flow in street intersections, *(ii)* vertical exchanges between the
90 sewer system and the streets, *(iii)* flow within regular grids of emerging rectangular obstacles
91 representing idealized buildings or building blocks and *(iv)* flow within more realistic urban districts.

92 Table 1 is organized in four blocks (I to IV), each of them corresponding to one flow type.

93 As shown in the first column of Table 1, the experiments considered five different **origins of the**
94 **water**, i.e. the cause of flooding. First, *upstream runoff* (UR) corresponds to experiments in which the
95 water is supplied from an upstream boundary, mainly via a reservoir with a controlled discharge. It
96 usually refers to flood events for which the overflow or rain takes place upstream of the urban area and
97 water enters the urban domain as surface flow. Second, *river overflow* (RO) corresponds to
98 configurations where the overflow takes place within the urban area and thus the river and the
99 overtopping of the banks are explicitly included in the experiments. In such a case, the upstream
100 boundary condition is a controlled discharge within the river. *Sewer overflow* (SO) is similar to river
101 overflow except that in this case the water invading the surface comes from an exceeded capacity of
102 the sewer within the urban domain; the upstream boundary condition is then a controlled discharge in
103 the sewer inlet. The fourth origin of water is the *rainfall* over the studied domain (RA), which is the
104 case of fully urban watersheds (Pons et al., 2005; Paquier and Bazin, 2014). Then the upstream
105 boundary condition is a complex spatial (and temporal) distribution of water jets from a well-
106 controlled rainfall simulator. Finally, the *tsunami* (TS) type is a long wave imposed off-shore that
107 propagates over the sea domain and invades an urban area when reaching the coast and overtopping

108 the shore protection furniture. Note that these five types of origin of the water can be unique or
109 coupled with each other, as for some UR & SO cases in Table 1 (ID 19, 20, 22, 23).

110 The diversity of the analysed **flow patterns** (columns 2, 5 and 7 in Table 1) emphasizes the
111 complexity of urban flood processes, involving subcritical and supercritical flow regimes, open-
112 channel and pressurized flow, both at the surface or in the underground system, interacting with
113 obstacles, building blocks *etc.* Among the 45 reported studies, very few address identical flow
114 patterns. The experimental set-ups reproduce either a synthetic urban area (highly simplified streets,
115 90° intersections and impervious rectangular buildings) or a simplified version of a real city
116 (reproducing the topology of the city but with a highly simplified representation of the facades and
117 street profiles) or finally a more realistic representation of an urban district based on the field DEM
118 (with each individual building being included).

119 The **location of the set-up** is indicated to help the reader contact the research team responsible for the
120 flume (columns 3 and 4 in Table 1). It also reveals that the experiments were performed in 17 different
121 countries, confirming the global interest for urban flood experimental data.

122 Columns 6 and 10 in Table 1 provide the **typical dimensions** of the laboratory model. A plausible
123 **scale factor** was derived, by assuming a typical street width equal to 15m and a gully width of 60cm
124 at the prototype scale. Some set-ups aim at analysing in detail local flow features (e.g. flow in a street
125 intersection, single vertical exchange structure, flow around one isolated building ...), while others
126 focus on larger scale flow characteristics, such as the flow in a street-network, but with a lower spatial
127 resolution and measurement accuracy. As a consequence, the scale factor of models of street
128 intersections or vertical exchange works typically ranges between 1/10 and 1/50, while those of
129 experiments covering an entire urban district or a grid of obstacles range between 1/30 and 1/200. The
130 experiments of Herbich and Shulits (1964) correspond to the largest model extent for tests involving a
131 grid of obstacles. The largest models of urban districts are those of (Ishigaki et al., 2003; Güney et al.,
132 2014), with a setup length of 20m and 16m, respectively, representing real-world urban areas of 3km
133 and 2.4km in length.

134 Finally, columns 8 and 9 in Table 1 report the **number of tested configurations** and **type of recorded**
135 **data**. The measured data strongly depend on the scale of the experiment. For very local flow patterns,
136 such as flows in street intersections and vertical exchange structures (blocks I and II in Table 1),
137 spatially distributed flow characteristics are generally available, including 3D velocity fields and 2D
138 water depth fields, together with more global flow variables such as discharges in the different
139 branches. Moreover, for these local flow pattern experiments, the number of tested configurations
140 remains low (below 10) when spatially distributed data were recorded; whereas it reaches up to 200
141 configurations when only the discharges were recorded. For the experiments investigating larger scale
142 flow patterns such as obstacle grids and urban districts, spatially distributed data are rare and mostly
143 local velocities and water depths were recorded with pointwise measurement tools, except for surface
144 velocity fields derived in some cases from large scale particle image velocimetry (using a camera
145 located above the experimental setup).

146 Overall, Table 1 demonstrates the availability of rich laboratory datasets covering a broad spectrum of
147 typical urban flood conditions. In the following, we distinguish between the flow processes
148 comprehensively studied and those calling for more laboratory investigations.

149

150 **3. Advances of urban flood processes analysis**

151 By listing the existing experimental datasets, Sect. 2 reveals that a wide range of flow processes were
152 reproduced experimentally. Here, we attempt to present an inventory of the main flow processes of
153 engineering relevance in urban flood studies (Table 2), and to relate them to the works listed in
154 Table 1. This enables assessing whether the existing experimental datasets are comprehensive enough
155 for the validation of the representation of each flow process in numerical models. Table 2 suggests that
156 experimental datasets do exist for most urban flow processes of interest; but not for all of them.

157 Regarding the **origin of water**, most common flood origins were reproduced experimentally. The
158 main deficiency is the intrusion of water waves from a storm surge, with the water from the sea,
159 overtopping the protection dikes and invading coastal cities with very unsteady flows, as described by
160 Maspataud et al. (2013). One main question is the evolution of the unsteadiness as the flow propagates

161 within the urban areas, merges or splits at crossroads and in open spaces: will the typical hydrograph
162 time-scale increase or decrease compared to the surge hydrograph? The validation of numerical
163 simulations certainly requires dedicated experimental data. Moreover, the knowledge on intrusion of
164 water through direct rain on the city domain should be further improved. In particular, as the rain falls
165 on the buildings roofs, part of the water reaches the sewer network (through the gutters) and the rest
166 reaches the surrounding streets or gardens (with possible infiltration) with some surface runoff on the
167 private slots. These processes, computed by Pons et al. (2005) and Paquier and Bazin (2014), still
168 require high quality data to enable deriving empirical parametrizations specific to urban catchments.
169 Future research should also consider the complex coupling between several flood origins.

170 Numerous datasets of flows in **street networks** (or within arrays of buildings) were published in the
171 recent years. These consider steady or unsteady flows, including steep hydrographs, at single or
172 multiple street intersections. One main deficiency regarding surface flow corresponds to the
173 consideration of obstacles present in the streets (Mignot et al., 2013) and steep urban areas where
174 mostly supercritical flow conditions take place. In such cases, hydraulic jumps occur at the street
175 intersections (Mignot et al., 2008) and in the vicinity of obstacles (Bazin et al., 2017).

176 Although the flow in street networks has been deeply studied experimentally, it is not the case of the
177 flow invading **other compartments of the urban fabric**:

- 178 • vertical flow interaction between the underground sewer and the street surface was
179 investigated locally, at the level of one exchange structure or a single street, but it remains
180 undocumented at the level of an entire urban district;
- 181 • similarly, data on flow exchanges between the streets and the blocks / slots (building blocks,
182 gardens, hospitals, etc...) through openings (gates, doors, windows...) remain scarce, both at
183 the local level (one facade, one building) and at the district level, while such calculations have
184 been performed for already some time (Hingray et al., 2000; Inoue et al., 2000).

185 Existing experimental works focused not only on the flow dynamics; but so-called “**associated**
186 **events**” have also been considered due to their importance for operational flood risk management. For
187 instance, much attention has been paid to the stability and safety of human beings and cars within

188 flooded streets. These valuable experiments enable estimating, from the hydrodynamics, the level of
189 risk for citizens and goods in flooded urban areas. Nevertheless, the behaviour of transported cars or
190 other mobile furniture (either floating or within the water column) in a street network, and the
191 possibility of creating dams at crossroads or street contractions (Mignot et al., 2006b) was not yet
192 investigated in laboratory experiments. Also, experiments on people evacuation were conducted at a
193 single institution (DRPI, Kyoto, Japan) and reproducing similar measurements is desirable.
194 Measurements of hydrodynamic forces on buildings or facades, and the transport of sediments in
195 flooded urban areas have received relatively little attention up to now. Finally, neither the access of
196 rescue vehicles through flooded streets, nor the dispersion of pollutants (e.g. from flooded industry or
197 damaged trucks) within a street network have been tested. Improved numerical modelling of these
198 “associated events” would be of substantial added-value for the management of urban flood risk, but
199 this still requires additional experimental data for model development and validation.

200

201

202 **4. Conclusion**

203 Based on the analysis of 45 laboratory studies and the identification of the main flow processes of
204 significance in urban flooding, the previous sections have highlighted the need for additional
205 (ambitious) experimental efforts to support the development and validation of more realistic
206 computational models of urban floods. This is particularly the case as next-generation urban flood
207 simulations should not only accurately replicate the water flows but also include the so-called
208 associated events (Sect. 3).

209 Indeed, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2, validation data are available for assessing most types of
210 numerical models commonly used in engineering and research to simulate urban floods, namely
211 (upper part of Table 3):

- 212 • 2D-SWE, or the 2D-SWE coupled with a porosity model, or the coupled 1D (in the streets)
213 and 2D (in the crossroads) SWE, to compute surface flow in the urban area;

- 214 • coupled 2D-SWE (in the streets) and 1D-SWE (in the sewer network), along with exchange
215 models, to compute the coupled flows in both the underground and surface layers of the urban
216 area;
- 217 • 2D-SWE or Boussinesq-type equations to compute long and/or short waves approaching the
218 shore and invading coastal urban areas;
- 219 • 3D Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations at the level of an isolated building (Gems et
220 al., 2016) or a single street intersection (Ghostine et al., 2009).

221 In contrast, more advanced numerical models (lower part of Table 3) are required to represent the
222 “associated events” occurring during urban floods, for which dedicated experimental data are virtually
223 unavailable. For instance, empirical or semi-analytical parametrizations are required to estimate the
224 amount of water entering the buildings or blocks, for computing sediment and pollutant transport in
225 urban environments, or entrainment of pieces of urban furniture within a flooded network of streets.
226 Similarly, specific numerical developments are needed for computing the behaviour of rescue
227 vehicles, citizen evacuation, etc. using agent based approaches.

228 The authors recommend that future experimental research aims at getting more quantitative insights
229 into these associated processes closely intertwined with flow behaviour during urban flooding. High
230 quality experimental observations of these processes will contribute to unlock key bottlenecks in the
231 current modelling practice and, consequently, pave the way for more integrative analyses of the urban
232 water and anthropic systems under (extreme) flooding conditions.

233

234 5. References

- 235 Abt, S.R., Wittier, R.J., Taylor, A., Love, D.J., 1989. Human stability in a high flood hazard zone. *Journal of the*
236 *American Water Resources Association* 25(4), 881–890.
- 237 Apel, H., Martinez Trepas, O., Nghia Hung, N., Thi Chinh, D., Merz, B., Viet Dung, N., 2016. Combined fluvial
238 and pluvial urban flood hazard analysis: Concept development and application to Can Tho city, Mekong
239 Delta, Vietnam. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16(4), 941–961.
- 240 Arrault, A., Finaud-Guyot, P., Archambeau, P., Bruwier, M., Erpicum, S., Piroton, M., Dewals, B., 2016.
241 Hydrodynamics of long-duration urban floods: hacknewline experiments and numerical modelling.
242 *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 16(6), 1413–1429.
- 243 Baba, Y., Ishigaki, T., Toda, K., 2017. Experimental studies on safety evacuation from underground spaces
244 under inundation situations. *Journal of JSCE* 5(1), 269–278.

245 Barkdoll, B.D., Hagen, B.L., Odgaard, A.J., 1998. Experimental comparison of dividing open-channel with duct
246 flow in T-junction. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 124(1), 92-95.

247 Bazin, P.-H., Mignot, E., Paquier, A., 2017. Computing flooding of crossroads with obstacles using a 2D
248 numerical model. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 55(1), 72–84.

249 Bazin, P.-H., Nakagawa, H., Kawaike, K., Paquier, A., Mignot, E., 2014. Modeling flow exchanges between a
250 street and an underground drainage pipe during urban floods. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 140(10),
251 04014051.

252 Beg, M.N.A., Carvalho, R.F., Leandro, J., 2017. Effect of surcharge on gully-manhole flow. *Journal of Hydro-*
253 *environment Research*. In press.

254 Beretta, R., Ravazzani, G., Maiorano, C., Mancini, M., 2018. Simulating the Influence of Buildings on Flood
255 Inundation in Urban Areas. *Geosciences* 8(2), 77.

256 Bernardini, G., Postacchini, M., Quagliarini, E., Brocchini, M., Cianca, C., D’Orazio, M., 2017. A preliminary
257 combined simulation tool for the risk assessment of pedestrians’ flood-induced evacuation.
258 *Environmental Modelling & Software* 96, 14–29.

259 Bruwier, M., Archambeau, P., Erpicum, S., Pirotton, M., Dewals, B., 2017. Shallow-water models with
260 anisotropic porosity and merging for flood modelling on Cartesian grids. *Journal of Hydrology* 554,
261 693–709.

262 Cea, L., Garrido, M., Puertas, J., 2010. Experimental validation of two-dimensional depth-averaged models for
263 forecasting rainfall-runoff from precipitation data in urban areas. *Journal of Hydrology* 382(1), 88–102.

264 Creëlle, S., Engelen, L., Schindfessel, L., Cunha Ramos, P., De Mulder, T., 2017. Experimental investigation of
265 free surface gradients in a 90° angled asymmetrical open channel confluence, *Advances*
266 *Hydroinformatics*. Sophia Antipolis, pp. 803–819.

267 Chen, Y., Zhou, H., Zhang, H., Du, G., Zhou, J., 2015. Urban flood risk warning under rapid urbanization,
268 *Environmental Research*, 139, 3–10.

269 Despotovic, J., Plavsic, J., Stefanovic, N., Pavlovic, D., 2005. Inefficiency of storm water inlets as a source of
270 urban floods. *Water Science and Technology* 51(2), 139–145.

271 Dottori F et al. (2013) Detailed data is welcome, but with a pinch of salt: Accuracy, precision, and uncertainty in
272 flood inundation modeling. *Water Resources Research* 49(9), 6079–6085.

273 ElKadi, K., Lewicki, L., Paquier, A., Rivière, N., Travin, G., 2011. Division of critical flow at three-branch
274 open-channel intersection. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 49(2), 231–238.

275 Falconer, R., Xia, J., Liang, D., Kvočka, D., 2017. Flood Modelling and hazard assessment for extreme events
276 in riverine basins, in: *Proceedings 37th IAHR World Congress*.

277 Fang, Q., 2016. Adapting Chinese cities to climate change. *Science* 354(6311), 425-426.

278 Finaud-Guyot, P., Garambois, P.-A., Araud, Q., Lawniczak, F., François, P., Vazquez, J., Mosé, R., 2018.
279 Experimental insight for flood flow repartition in urban areas. *Urban Water Journal* 15(3), 1–9.

280 Fraga, I., Cea, L., Puertas, J., 2017. Validation of a 1D-2D dual drainage model under unsteady part-full and
281 surcharged sewer conditions. *Urban Water Journal* 14(1), 74–84.

282 Gems, B., Mazzorana, B., Hofer, T., Sturm, M., Gabl, R., Aufleger, M., 2016. 3-D hydrodynamic modelling of
283 flood impacts on a building and indoor flooding processes. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*
284 16(6), 1351–1368.

285 Ghostine, R., Hoteit, I., Vazquez, J., Terfous, A., Ghenaim, A., Mose, R., 2015. Comparison between a coupled
286 1D-2D model and a fully 2D model for supercritical flow simulation in crossroads. *Journal of Hydraulic*
287 *Research* 53(2), 274–281.

288 Ghostine, R., Kesserwani, G., Vazquez, J., Rivière, N., Ghenaim, A., Mose, R., 2009. Simulation of supercritical
289 flow in crossroads: Confrontation of a 2D and 3D numerical approaches to experimental results.
290 *Computers & Fluids* 38(2), 425–432.

291 Glenis, V., McGough, A.-S., Kutija, V., Kilsby, C., Woodman, S., 2013. Flood modelling for cities using Cloud
292 computing. *Journal of Cloud Computing: Advances, Systems and Applications* 2(1), 7.

293 Goseberg, N., 2013. Reduction of maximum tsunami run-up due to the interaction with beachfront development
294 - application of single sinusoidal waves. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 13(11), 2991–
295 3010.

296 Guillen-Ludena, S., D. Lopez, N. Riviere, Mignot, E., 2017. Extreme flood flow in an increasingly urbanized
297 floodplain: an experimental approach. 37th IAHR world congress, in: *Theme(2) Flood Management*,
298 *Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*.

299 Güney, M.S., Tayfur, G., Bombar, G., Elci, S., 2014. Distorted Physical Model to Study Sudden Partial Dam
300 Break Flows in an Urban Area. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 140(11), 05014006.

301 Hager, W.H., 1989a. Supercritical flow in channel junctions. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 115(5), 595-616.

302 Hager, W.H., 1989b. Transitional flow in channel junctions. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 115(2), 243-259.

303 Herbich, J.B., Shulits, S., 1964. Large-scale roughness in open-channel flow, in: Proceedings American Society
304 Civil Engineers 90(HY6).

305 Hingray, B., Cappelaere, B., Bouvier, C., Desbordes, M., 2000. Hydraulic vulnerability of elementary urban cell.
306 Journal of Hydrologic Engineering 5(4), 402–410.

307 Huang, C.-J., Hsu, M.-H., Teng, W.-H., Wang, Y.-H., 2014. The Impact of Building Coverage in the
308 Metropolitan Area on the Flow Calculation. Water 6(8), 2449–2466.

309 Ishigaki, T., Keiichi, T., Kazuya, I., 2003. Hydraulic model tests of inundation in urban area with underground
310 space. Theme B, Proc. of XXX IAHR Congress, Greece.

311 Ishigaki, T., Y. Asai, Y.O. ans, Toda, K., Shimada, H., 2008. Evacuation criteria during urban flooding in
312 underground space. Proc. of 11th Conference on Urban Drainage, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.

313 Inoue, K. Kawaike, K., Hayashi, H., 2000. Numerical simulation models of inundation flow in urban area. J.
314 Hydrosci. Hyd. Engng 18(1), 119-126.

315 Isidoro, J.M.G.P., Lima, J.L.M.P. de, Leandro, J., 2013. The study of rooftop connectivity on the rainfall-runoff
316 process by means of a rainfall simulator and a physical model. Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie,
317 Supplementary Issues 57(1), 177–191.

318 JinNoh, S., Lee, S., An, H., Kawaike, K., Nakagawa, H., 2016. Ensemble urban flood simulation in comparison
319 with laboratory-scale experiments: Impact of interaction models for manhole, sewer pipe, and surface
320 flow. Advances in Water Resources 97, 25–37.

321 Kim, B., Sanders, B.F., Famiglietti, J.S., Guinot, V., 2015. Urban flood modeling with porous shallow-water
322 equations: A case study of model errors in the presence of anisotropic porosity. Journal of Hydrology
323 523, 680–692.

324 Kreibich H., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Bouwer, L.M., Bubeck, P., Ciavola, P., Green, C., Hallegatte, S., Logar, I.,
325 Meyer, V., Schwarze, R., Thieken, A.H., 2014. Costing natural hazards. Nat Clim Change 4(5), 303–
326 306.

327 Kvočka, D., Falconer, R.A., Bray, M., 2016. Flood hazard assessment for extreme flood events. Natural Hazards
328 84(3), 1569-1599.

329 LaRocque, L.A., Elkholy, M., Chaudhry, M.H., Imran, J., 2013. Experiments on urban flooding caused by a
330 levee breach. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering 139(9), 960-973.

331 Leandro, J., Carvalho, R., Martins, R., 2010. Experimental scaled-model as a benchmark for validation of urban
332 flood models. Novatech, GRAIE, Lyon, France.

333 Leandro, J., Chen, A.S., Djordjevic, S., Savic, D.A., 2009. Comparison of 1D/1D and 1D/2D coupled
334 (sewer/surface) hydraulic models for urban flood simulation. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering 135(6),
335 495–504.

336 Lee, S., Nakagama, H., Kawaike, K., Zhang, H., 2012. Study on inlet discharge coefficient through the different
337 shapes of storm drains for urban inundation analysis. Journal of Japan Society of Civil Engineers, Ser.
338 B1 (Hydraulic Engineering) 68(4), I_31–I_36.

339 Lhomme, J., Soares-Frazaõ, S., Guinot, V., Zech, y., 2007. Modélisation à grande échelle des inondations
340 urbaines et modèle 2D à porosité. La Houille Blanche 4, 104-110.

341 Liu, L., Sun, J., Lin, B., Lu, L., 2018. Building performance in dam-break flow - an experimental study. Urban
342 Water Journal 15(3), 251–258.

343 Lopes, P., Carvalho, R.F., Leandro, J., 2017. Numerical and experimental study of the fundamental flow
344 characteristics of a 3D gully box under drainage. Water Science and Technology 75(9), 2204–2215.

345 Mark, O., Weesakul, S., Apirumanekul, C., Aroonnet, S.B., Djordjevic, S., 2004. Potential and limitations of 1D
346 modelling of urban flooding. Journal of Hydrology 299(3), 284–299.

347 Martínez-Gomariz, E., Gómez, M., Russo, B., 2016. Experimental study of the stability of pedestrians exposed
348 to urban pluvial flooding, Natural Hazards 82(2), 1259-1278.

349 Martínez-Gomariz, E., Gómez, M., Russo, B., Djordjevic, S., 2017. A new experiments-based methodology to
350 define the stability threshold for any vehicle exposed to flooding, Urban Water Journal 14 (9), 930-939

351 Martínez-Gomariz, E., Gómez, M., Russo, B., Djordjevic, S., 2018. Stability criteria for flooded vehicles: a
352 state-of-the-art review. Journal of Flood Risk Management 11(S2), S817–S826.

353 Martins, R., Kesserwani, G., Rubinato, M., Lee, S., Leandro, J., Djordjević, S., Shucksmith, J. D., 2017.
354 Validation of 2D shock capturing flood models around a surcharging manhole. Urban Water Journal,
355 14(9), 892-899.

356 Maspataud, A., Ruz, M.-H., Vanhée, S., 2013. Potential impacts of extreme storm surges on a low-lying densely
357 populated coastline: the case of Dunkirk area, Northern France. Natural Hazards 66(3), 1327–1343.

358 Mignot, E., Bonakdari, H., Knothe, P., Kouyi, G.L., Bessette, A., Rivière, N., Bertrand-Krajewski, J.-L., 2012.
359 Experiments and 3D simulations of flow structures in junctions and their influence on location of
360 flowmeters. Water Science and Technology 66(6), 1325–1332.

361 Mignot, E., Paquier, A., Ishigaki, T., 2006a. Comparison of numerical and experimental simulations of a flood in
362 a dense urban area. *Water Science and Technology* 54(6-7), 65–73.

363 Mignot E., Paquier A., Haider S., 2006b. Modeling floods in a dense urban area using 2D shallow water
364 equations. *Journal of Hydrology* 327 (1-2), 186-199.

365 Mignot, E., Rivière, N., Perkins, R.J., Paquier, A., 2008. Flow patterns in a four-branch junction with
366 supercritical flow. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 134(6), 701–713.

367 Mignot, E., Rivière, N., Perkins, R.J., Paquier, A., Travin, G., 2009. Closure of flow patterns in a four branch
368 junction with supercritical flow. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 135(11), 1023-1024.

369 Mignot, E., Zeng, C., Dominguez, G., Li, C.-W., Rivière, N., Bazin, P.-H., 2013. Impact of topographic
370 obstacles on the discharge distribution in open-channel bifurcations. *Journal of Hydrology* 494, 10–19.

371 Nanía, L.S., Gómez, M., Dolz, J., 2004. Experimental study of the dividing flow in steep street crossings. *Journal*
372 *of Hydraulic Research* 42(4), 406–412.

373 Nanía, L.S., Gómez, M., Dolz, J., Comas, P., Pomares, J., 2011. Experimental Study of Subcritical Dividing
374 Flow in an Equal-Width, Four-Branch Junction. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 137(10), 1298-1305.

375 Nanía, L.S., Gonzalo, R., Gómez, M., 2014. Influence of Channel Width on Flow Distribution in Four-Branch
376 Junctions with Supercritical Flow: Experimental Approach. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 140(1),
377 77-88.

378 Neal, J.C., Bates, P.D., Fewtrell, T.J., Hunter, N.M., Wilson, M., Horritt, M.S., 2009. Distributed whole city
379 water level measurements from the Carlisle 2005 urban flood event and comparison with hydraulic
380 model simulations. *Journal of Hydrology* 368(1), 42–55.

381 Ozdemir, H., Sampson, C.C., Almeida, G.A.M. de, Bates, P.D., 2013. Evaluating scale and roughness effects in
382 urban flood modelling using terrestrial LIDAR data. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* 17(10),
383 4015–4030.

384 Paquier, A., Bazin, P.H., 2014. Estimating uncertainties for urban floods modelling. *La Houille Blanche* 6, 13-
385 18.

386 Paquier, A., Mignot, E., Bazin, P.-H., 2015. From Hydraulic Modelling to Urban Flood Risk. *Procedia*
387 *Engineering* 115, 37–44.

388 Park, H., Cox, D.T., Lynett, P.J., Wiebe, D.M., Shin, S., 2013. Tsunami inundation modeling in constructed
389 environments: A physical and numerical comparison of free-surface elevation, velocity, and momentum
390 flux. *Coastal Engineering* 79, 9–21.

391 Pons, F., Zhang, B., Sergent, P., Feltz, D., 2005. Simulation of flash floods in Marseille and Bordeaux with a
392 two-dimensional runoff model, in 10th International Conference of Urban Drainage. Copenhagen,
393 Denmark.

394 Rivière, N., Travin, G., Perkins, R.J., 2011. Subcritical open channel flows in four branch intersections. *Water*
395 *Resources Research* 47(10), 2011WR010504.

396 Rivière, N., Travin, G., Perkins, R.J., 2014. Transcritical flows in three and four branch open-channel
397 intersections. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 140(4), 04014003.

398 Rivière, N., Xiao, M., Perkins, R.J., Travin, G., 2018. Supercritical flow expansion in an open channel
399 bifurcation. In review at *Journal of Hydraulic Research*.

400 Rodi, W., 2017. Turbulence modeling and simulation in hydraulics: a historical review. *Journal of Hydraulic*
401 *Engineering* 143(5), 03117001.

402 Romagnoli, M., Carvalho, R., Leandro, J., 2013. Turbulence characterization in a gully with reverse flow.
403 *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 139(7), 736-744.

404 Rubinato, M., Martins, R., Kesserwani, G., Leandro, J., Djordjevic, S., Shucksmith, J., 2017. Experimental
405 calibration and validation of sewer/surface flow exchange equations in steady and unsteady flow
406 conditions. *Journal of Hydrology* 552, 421–432.

407 Russo, B., Gómez, M., Macchione, F., 2013. Pedestrian hazard criteria for flooded urban areas. *Natural Hazards*
408 69(1), 251–265.

409 Russo, B., Gómez, M., Tellez, J., 2013. Methodology to estimate the hydraulic efficiency of nontested
410 continuous transverse grates. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 139(10), 864-871.

411 Schindfessel, L., Creëlle, S., De Mulder, T., 2015. Flow patterns in an open channel confluence with
412 increasingly dominant tributary inflow. *Water* 7(9), 4724–4751.

413 Seyoum, S., Vojinovic, Z., Price, R.K., Weesakul, S., 2012. Coupled 1D and Noninertia 2D Flood Inundation
414 Model for Simulation of Urban Flooding. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 138(1), 23–34.

415 Smith L.S., Liang, Q., Quinn, P.F., 2015. Towards a hydrodynamic modelling framework appropriate for
416 applications in urban flood assessment and mitigation using heterogeneous computing. *Urban Water*
417 *Journal* 12(1), 67–78.

418 Smith, G.P., Rahman, P.F., Wasko, C., 2016. A comprehensive urban floodplain dataset for model
419 benchmarking. *International Journal of River Basin Management* 14(3), 345–356.

420 Soares-Frazão, S., Zech, Y., 2008. Dam-break flow through an idealised city. *Journal of Hydraulic Research*
421 46(5), 648–658.

422 Sturm, M., Gems B., Keller F. Mazzorana B. Fuchs S. Papatoma-Köhle M., M., A., 2018. Experimental
423 measurements of flood-induced impact forces on exposed elements, in: *Proceedings RiverFlow 2018*
424 conference.

425 Takayama, T., Takara, K., Toda, K., Fujita, M., Mase, H., Tachikawa, Y., Yoneyama, N., Tsutsumi, D., T.
426 Yasuda, Sayama, T., 2007. Research works for risk assessment technology related to flood in urban
427 area. *Annals of Disas. Prev. Res. Inst., Kyoto Univ.*, No. 50 C.

428 Teng, J., Jakeman, A.J., Vaze, J., Croke, B.F.W., Dutta, D., Kim, S., 2017. Flood inundation modelling: A
429 review of methods, recent advances and uncertainty analysis. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 90,
430 201–216.

431 Testa, G., Zuccala, D., Alcrudo, F., Mulet, J., Soares-Frazão, S., 2007. Flash flood flow experiment in a
432 simplified urban district. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 45(sup1), 37–44.

433 Tomiczek, T., Prasetyo, A., Mori, N., Yasuda, T., Kennedy, A., 2016. Physical modelling of tsunami onshore
434 propagation, peak pressures, and shielding effects in an urban building array. *Coastal Engineering* 117,
435 97–112.

436 UNISDR, 2015. *The human cost of weather related disasters, CRED 1995-2015*, Unites Nations, Geneva.

437 Van Ootegem, L., Van Herck, K., Creten, T., Verhofstadt, E., Foresti, L., Goudenhoofdt, E., Reyniers, M.,
438 Delobbe, L., Murla Tuyls, D., Willems, P., 2016. Exploring the potential of multivariate depth-damage
439 and rainfall-damage models. *Journal of Flood Risk Management* 11(S2), S916-S929.

440 Velickovic, M., Zech, Y., Soares-Frazão, S., 2017. Steady-flow experiments in urban areas and anisotropic
441 porosity model. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 55(1), 85–100.

442 Wang, H., Mostafizi, A., Cramer, L.A., Cox, D., Park, H., 2016. An agent-based model of a multimodal near-
443 field tsunami evacuation: Decision-making and life safety. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging*
444 *Technologies* 64, 86–100.

445 Weber, L.J., Schumate, E.D., Mawer, N., 2001. Experiments on flow at a 90° open-channel junction. *Journal of*
446 *Hydraulic Engineering* 127(5), 340–350.

447 Xia, J., Falconer, R.A., Wang, Y., Xiao, X., 2014. New criterion for the stability of a human body in
448 floodwaters. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 52(1), 93–104.

449 Yasuda, T., Hiraishi, T., 2004. Experimental Study of Tsunami Inundation in Coastal Urban Area, in:
450 *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Offshore Polar Engineering Conference*.

451 Zhou, Q., Yu, W., Chen, A.S., Jiang, C., Fu, G., 2016. Experimental Assessment of Building Blockage Effects in
452 a Simplified Urban District. *Procedia Engineering* 154, 844-852.

453

454

455 **List of Table captions:**

456 Table 1: Databases available in literature for validation of urban flood numerical models

457

458 Table 2: Urban flood processes and corresponding data availability for validation

459

460 Table 3: Typology of numerical models applied to compute urban flood events

461

Table
[Click here to download Table: Table 1_final.DOC](#)

1

Table 1: Databases available in literature for validation of urban flood numerical models

Water origin ⁽¹⁾	Flow pattern	Location of set-up	Reference	Additional remarks	Length of set-up (m)	Steady (S)/ Unsteady (U)	Number of configurations [Availability] ⁽²⁾	Types of data	Scale factors ⁽³⁾	ID
I Flow at street intersections										
UR	3-branch subcritical junction	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Mignot et al. (2012)		5	S	1 [B]	3D velocity field	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(1)
		IIHR (Iowa, USA)	Weber et al. (2001)		22	S	6 [A]	3D velocity field	$S_w=0.91m$ SF~1/16	(2)
		Gent University (Gent, Belgium)	Schindfessel et al. (2015)	Rectangular sections with chamfers	33	S	2 [D]	3D velocity field	$S_w=0.98m$ SF~1/15	(3)
		Gent University (Gent, Belgium)	Creëlle et al. (2017)		12	S	6 [D]	Water depth field	$S_w=0.4m$ SF~1/38	(4)
UR	3 branch transcritical and supercritical junction	EPFL (Lausanne, Switzerland)	Hager (1989a & 1989b)		2	S	8 [A] & [C]	2D velocity field	$S_w=0.099m$ SF~1/152	(5)
UR	3-branch subcritical bifurcation	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Mignot et al. (2013)	Without/with 10 obstacles (urban furniture)	5	S	14 flows x 10 obstacles [D]	* Flow discharge + 2D velocity field (for 1 flow with 10 obstacle configs.)	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(6)
		IIHR (Iowa, USA)	Barkdoll et al. (1998)		2.7	S	1 [C]	2D velocity field & water depth field	$S_w=0.152m$ SF~1/100	(7)
UR	3-branch critical & supercritical bifurcation	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	ElKadi et al. (2011)		5	S	~100 [B]	Discharge distribution to the downstream branches + water depth field for 1 flow	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(8)
		INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Rivière et al. (2018)		5	S	62 [B]	Discharge distribution and water depth fields	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(9)
UR	4-branch subcritical intersection	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Rivière et al. (2011)		5	S	220 [B]	Discharge distribution to the downstream branches	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(10)
		UPC (Barcelona, Spain)	Nania et al. (2011)		8.5	S	159 [A]	Discharge distribution to the downstream branches	$S_w=1.5m$ SF~1/10	(11)
UR	4-branch transcritical & supercritical flows	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Rivière et al. (2014)		5	S	113 [B]	Discharge distribution to the downstream branches	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(12)
		INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Mignot et al. (2009) & Mignot et al. (2008)		4.5	S	~200 [B] & [B]	Discharge distributions to the downstream branches + 8 water depth fields	$S_w=0.3m$ SF~1/50	(13)
		UPC (Barcelona, Spain)	Nania et al. (2004) & Nania et al. (2014)		8.5	S	~200 [B] & [B]	Discharge distribution to the downstream branches	$S_w=1.5m$ SF~1/10	(14)
II Vertical exchanges (street/sewage)										
SO	1 overflow exchange structure (1 way: from	University of Coimbra (Coimbra,	Lopes et al. (2017) & Romagnoli et al.		0.6	S	4 [B] & [B]	3D velocity field	$G_w=0.6m$ SF~1	(15)

Water origin ⁽¹⁾	Flow pattern	Location of set-up	Reference	Additional remarks	Length of set-up (m)	Steady (S)/ Unsteady (U)	Number of configurations [Availability] ⁽²⁾	Types of data	Scale factors ⁽³⁾	ID
	sewer to surface)	Portugal	(2013)							
UR	1 inlet exchange structure (1 way: from surface to sewer)	UPC (Barcelona, Spain)	Russo, Gómez, and Tellez (2013)		5.5	S	280 [B]	Exchanged discharge to sewer	SF=1	(16)
		Faculty of Civil Engineering (Belgrade, Serbia)	Despotovic et al. (2005)	(without and with clogging effects)	5	S	~100 [C]	Exchanged discharge to sewer + flow spreading on the street	SF=1	(17)
		DPRI (Kyoto, Japan)	Lee et al. (2012)		6	S	12 [B]	Exchanged discharge + water depths	SF=1/10	(18)
UR & SO	1 exchange structure (2 ways between surface and sewer)	University of Sheffield (UK)	Rubinato et al. (2017) & Martins et al. (2017)		8	S + U	46 [A] & [A]	Exchanged discharges (steady + time evolution) + water depths	SF=1/6	(19)
		U. of Coimbra (Portugal)	Beg et al. (2017)		9.5	S	19 [B]	Exchanged discharges + velocity fields + pressure heads	$S_w=0.6$ SF=1	(20)
UR	1 street with several inlets	U. of Coimbra (Portugal)	Leandro et al. (2010)		36	S	36 [B]	Exchanged discharge	$S_w=0.5m$ SF=1/30	(21)
UR & SO	1 street with several exchange structures (2 ways)	DPRI (Kyoto, Japan)	Bazin et al. (2014) JinNoh et al. (2016)		10	S + U	2 steady 2 unsteady [C] 6 steady 2 unsteady [B]	Water depth and pressure head along the street (+ total exchanged discharge for Bazin2014)	$S_w=0.8m$ SF=1/20 SF=1/20	(22)
UR & SO	1 half-street + 3 exchange structures (2 ways: collect and overflow)	University of A Coruna (A Coruna, Spain)	Fraga et al. (2017)		6	S + U	5 [B]	Water depth in street and in pipes + discharge in pipes	SF=1	(23)
III Flow through a regular grid of emerging obstacles										
			Soares-Frazaó and Zech (2008)	aligned obstacle grid (aligned with flow axis and rotated)		U (dam break)	2 [B]	Water depth Surface velocity fields		(24)
		UCL (Louvain la Neuve, Belgium)	Velickovic et al. (2017)		15	S	20 [B]	Water depth profiles	$S_w=0.1m$ SF=1/150	(25)
			Lhomme et al. (2007)	Staggered obstacle grid (aligned with flow axis)			1 [D]	Water depths Surface velocity fields		(26)
UR	Non-uniform flow in a patch of obstacles	CESI (Milan, Italy)	Testa et al. (2007)	aligned & staggered obstacles	5	U (dam break)	12 [A]	Water depths	SF=1/100	(27)
		National Taiwan University (Taiwan)	Huang et al. (2014)	aligned obstacles (aligned with flow axis)	8	S	7 [D]	Water depth profiles	Various S_w	(28)
		KICT (South Korea)	Kim et al. (2015)	Aligned obstacles	30	U (dam break)	2 [D]	Water depths	$S_w=0.1m$ SF=1/150	(29)

Water origin ⁽¹⁾	Flow pattern	Location of set-up	Reference	Additional remarks	Length of set-up (m)	Steady (S)/ Unsteady (U)	Number of configurations [Availability] ⁽²⁾	Types of data	Scale factors ⁽³⁾	ID
		Tsinghua Université (Beijing, China)	Zhou and W. Yu (2016)	Aligned obstacles: pervious & impervious	10	S	30 [D]	Water depths + 2D velocity fields	$S_w=0.05m$ SF=1/300	(30)
UR	Uniform flow in a large grid of obstacles	INSA/LMFA (Lyon, France)	Guillen-Ludena et al. (2017)	Aligned obstacles on rough bed with forces on buildings	8	S	50 [B]	Normal water depth + Forces on buildings (50 exp) & 2D velocity field (1 exp)	Various S_w	(31)
		Pennsylvania State U. (USA)	Herbich and Shulits (1964)	Staggered obstacles	16	S	80 [C]	Normal water depth (uniform flow)	Various S_w	(32)
RO	River overflow around obstacles	Polytechnico di Milano (Italy)	Beretta et al. (2018)		2.23	S	1 [B]	Local velocities and water depths	SF=1/25	(33)
RA	Rain over a group of buildings	University of Coimbra (Portugal)	Isidoro et al. (2013)	Rain with/without wind effect and static/dynamic storm effects. 4 tested building distributions	2	U	30 [B]	Outflow hydrographs	Various S_w	(34)
			Cea et al. (2010)	Rain over buildings with roofs	2.5	U	72 [B]	Outflow hydrographs	Various S_w	(35)
TS	Long wave over an obstacle grid at the shore	DPRI (Kyoto, Japan)	Tomiczek et al. (2016)	Aligned obstacles	45	U	63 (2 repetitions) [B]	Water depth + pressure on obstacles	SF=1/20	(36)
			Leibniz University (Hanover, Germany)	Goseberg (2013)	Aligned and staggered obstacles		18	24 (290 with repetitions) [A]	Maximum run-up extension, water depths, velocities	Various S_w
IV Urban district										
UR	Flow in a street network	DPRI (Kyoto, Japan)	Ishigaki et al. (2003)	With & without connections (48) to underground	20	U	2 [C]	Water depths, surface velocities & outflow discharges	SF=1/100	(38)
			IMFS (Strasbourg, France)	Arrault et al. (2016) and Finaud-Guyot et al. (2018)	Synthetic district	5	S	16 [B]	Water depth profiles & Outflow discharges	SF=1/200
RO	Flow around buildings	Univ. of South Carolina (Columbia, USA)	LaRocque et al. (2013)	River overtopping towards urbanized area	12	S	2 [A]	Surface velocity field + water depth field	SF=1/50	(40)
UR		UNSW (Sydney, Australia)	Smith et al. (2016)	Mostly supercritical flows	12.5	S	1 [A]	Surface velocity field + water depth field	SF=1/30	(41)
UR		Dokuz Eylül University (Izmir, Turkey)	Güney et al. (2014)	Dam break on a group of buildings	16	U	1 (5 repetitions) [D]	Water depths (10 locations) and velocities (4 locations)	SF=1/150	(42)

Water origin ⁽¹⁾	Flow pattern	Location of set-up	Reference	Additional remarks	Length of set-up (m)	Steady (S)/ Unsteady (U)	Number of configurations [Availability] ⁽²⁾	Types of data	Scale factors ⁽³⁾	ID
		Turkey)								
RO		University of Innsbruck (Austria)	Sturm et al. (2018)	Supercritical & flow within buildings	9	U (Fixed discharge in the river upstream)	140 [D]	Forces on buildings, water depths, flow velocities	SF=1/30	(43)
TS	Long wave over a realistic planning at the shore	PARI (Yokosuda, Japan)	Yasuda (2004)	with openings towards underground	34	U	4 [C]	Water depths + flood extension	SF=1/50	(44)
		Oregon State University (Corvallis, USA)	Park et al. (2013)		40		1 (99 repetitions) [B]	Water depths and velocities	SF=1/50	(45)

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

⁽¹⁾ UR=Upstream runoff, RO = River overflow, SO = Sewer overflow, TS=Tsunami, RA = Rain over the domain

⁽²⁾ A = Available on the Internet or in the article, B = Available upon demand, C = Likely not available, D = No information about availability

⁽³⁾ S_w= street width in model, G_w = gully width in model, SF= horizontal scale factor reported by authors or computed using typical field values S_w=15m and G_w=0.6m in prototype

Note: In terms of discharge distribution in 3-branch subcritical and transcritical bifurcation flow configurations without obstacle (very simple cases), the recent works by Rivière et al. (2011, 2014) propose a review of available discharge distribution data. The reader can refer to these papers for a list of available data and corresponding references.

Table 2: Urban flood processes and corresponding data availability for validation

Main processes	Sub-processes	Id. from Table 1	S,C*
Origin of the water	Rain on urban domain	34, 35	S
	River overtopping towards urban area	33, 40, 43	C
	Dam break upstream from city	24, 27, 29, 42	C
	Tsunami (long) wave invading the city	36, 37, 44, 45	C
	Wave submersion / storm surges	Not available	-
	Sewage overflow	15, 19-23	C
Flow in streets	Open-channel flows around a group of buildings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Steady state</i> • <i>Transient flow (bank overtopping, flood wave, dike submersion wave...)</i> • <i>Subcritical flow regime</i> • <i>Supercritical flow regime</i> • <i>Wave front</i> 	25, 26, 28, 30-33, 40, 41	C
	Open-channel flows in one street intersection	24, 27, 29, 34-37, 42-45	C
	Open-channel flows in a street network: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Steady</i> • <i>Transient flow</i> • <i>Subcritical flow regime</i> • <i>Supercritical flow regime</i> 	25, 26, 28, 30-33	C
		41, 43	S
		24, 27, 29, 36, 37, 42, 44, 45	C
		1-14	C
		39	S
		38	S
		38, 39	S
		Not available	-
		Flow interaction with fixed furniture	6
Flow in other compartments of the urban fabric	Sewer-street exchanges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>1 exchange structure</i> • <i>1 street & 1 pipe with exchange structures</i> • <i>Street & pipe network with exchange structures</i> 	15-20	C
		21-23	S
		Not available	-
	Flow within and through buildings / building blocks	30, 43 + Liu et al. (2018)	S
	Flow through open-areas: gardens / semi-urbanized private parcel / above walls / through vegetated or semi-pervious fences...	Not available	-
	Flow in underground spaces	38 + Takayama et al. (2007)	S
Associated events	Cars transport : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stability of a single car</i> • <i>A group of cars in one street intersection creating dams</i> • <i>Single car or a group of cars transported in a street network</i> 	Ref ⁽¹⁾	C
		Not available	-
		Not available	-
	Risk and evacuation of people : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Human stability</i> • <i>Human evacuation (through doors, corridor, staircase, from cars)</i> 	Ref ⁽²⁾	C
		Ref ⁽³⁾	S
	Forces on buildings	31, 43	S
	Sediment transport	43	S
	Rescue access and processes (via army, ambulance, fire-men, etc...)	Not available	-
	Pollution dispersion	Not available	-

* S=scare, C=comprehensive

⁽¹⁾ see recent extensive review by Martínez-Gomariz et al. (2018) and recent work by Martínez-Gomariz et al. (2017).⁽²⁾ see Abt et al. (1989), Russo, Gómez, and Macchione (2013), Xia et al. (2014), Martínez-Gomariz et al. (2016) and the review by Kvočka et al. (2016); older papers also exist.

⁽³⁾ see Ishigaki et al. (2008) and Baba et al. (2017)

Table 3: Typology of numerical models applied to compute urban flood events

Type of model	Typical processes	Level of development ⁽⁴⁾	Available exp. data (Yes, No)
3D RANS ⁽¹⁾ or LES ⁽²⁾	1 street intersection Flow around 1 building	C	Y
2D SWE ⁽³⁾	Street surface (local to large scale)	C	Y
2D SWE + porosity models	Urban district	C / R	Y
1D-2D SWE (1D=streets / 2D=crossroads)	Urban district	R	Y
1D-2D SWE (1D=sewer / 2D=streets)	Coupled flow in streets and sewers	R	Y
2D SWE or Boussinesq-type equations	Overland Tsunami	C	Y
Hydrodynamics + morphodynamic model	Building foundation scour, sediment deposits around buildings...	U	N
Hydrodynamics + empirical /analytical exchange formulae	Flow exchange between streets and built-up or open areas through openings (gates, doors, windows...)	U	N
Hydrodynamics + advection-diffusion model	Pollutant transport	U	N
Hydrodynamics + Lagrangian model	Transport of urban furniture and debris (cars, trees, etc...)	U	N
Hydrodynamics + agent based model	Citizen evacuation, rescue access	R ⁽⁵⁾	N

⁽¹⁾ Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations;⁽²⁾ Large-Eddy simulations;⁽³⁾ Shallow-water equations (see Rodi (2017) for details of the models and applications);⁽⁴⁾ C = common practice, R = research models, U = unavailable in the context of urban flood modelling;⁽⁵⁾ Mostly for tsunami cases, see for instance Wang et al. (2016).