

SESSION 5: SUBMITTED CONTRIBUTIONS AND DISCUSSION

K. F. Gardiner, Severn-Trent Water Authority

Bearing in mind the difficulties that are experienced by new users in the calculation of PR and its application to areas drained by more than one system (e.g. partially separate), will the proposed changes to the surface run-off sub model in future WASSP revisions overcome the problem?

R. Price

HR are looking at revised surface run-off calculation methods. However, there appears to be a consensus for no major changes to WASSP for some time. It is thought that engineers should have time to consolidate the use of existing procedures. The next major alteration could be a complete replacement WASSP.

-----

R. Chaplin, Doncaster MBC

Experienced problems modelling an empty off-line tank. Why is there a need for dry weather flows to be passed through an off-line tank?

R. Price

The off-line tank is modelled in a simple way but it is now apparent that a large number of configurations are possible, including the possibility that dry weather flows may pass through.

D. Balmforth

A number of WaPUG User Notes in preparation will deal with ancillary modelling problems.

-----

R. Ashley, Dundee College of Technology.

Described an ancillary modelling problem in an old sewerage system in Dundee. The system contains a series of gate controlled throttles on a main section which determine overflow operations to a river. In addition to massive numbering problems orifice shapes and coefficients are difficult to determine.

No solution was suggested but the general opinion was that the model should be based on the dominant flow process (i.e. the main sewer instead of the subsidiary outfalls).

A. Ryan, Wyre District Council.

A model for Poulton-le-Fylde in Lancashire was simplified by grouping or deleting overflows and loops. A flow survey was then carried out with a number of pipes blocked by sandbags.

D. Dring

Confirmed that a similar procedure had been experienced in Severn-Trent Water Authority.

-----

A. Ryan

A 1 in 5 year observed event did not appear to produce the flooding predicted by WASSP. It is suspected that this is due to under reporting of flooding problems by the public.

R. Price

The original procedure aimed to link the return period of flow to the return period of event through UCWI. We therefore have to assume that a 1 in 5 year flow is produced by a 1 in 5 year event. However, surcharge depths are very sensitive to local geometry, e.g. roughness factor, headloss. This is likely to result in inaccuracies in flood volume predictions. Significant and non-significant flooding predictions should be considered separately.

-----

A. Eadon, chairman of WaPUG, briefly summarised the days proceedings and thanked Strathclyde Regional Council for their hospitality.

The meeting was attended by 62 delegates.