

Points Raised at Workshop on  
Planning and Resource for Gathering Input Data.

After a brief foray into estimating the cost of Drainage Area Studies most time was spent discussing sewer location surveys. Many questions were raised but few were answered for example:

1. What should be the extent of the survey?
2. Who should do it? Contractor or in-house?
3. What checks are needed for quality control ? How much does survey cost as a % of the total cost?

It was apparent that the quality and extent of records varied enormously between different agents and this could lead to a problem where part of a drainage area lay outside one's own Authority. If records for the adjacent area are poor or even non-existent, then a problem would arise in designing a system receiving external inputs. Verification of this type of system is not a problem as a monitored input hydrograph can be used. Problems arise when design is considered; what is the input hydrograph? Bristol have this problem and are synthesising the external system on the basis of the best available information from O.S. maps etc. The outcome of this exercise may be of interest at a future meeting.

The second largest topic, flow surveys and verification was outside the groups remit but was discussed due to its impact on resurvey / field checking considerations. The major question raised was, should the flow survey be assumed to be accurate? The general feeling was that it should be taken as accurate until all other checks e.g. field checks on contributing areas, missing overflows etc. had been completed and then if verification was not achieved the flow survey data should be questioned.

It was generally agreed that good historical records of flooding are "pearls of great price", but not as readily available as we would like. Knocking on doors near where the model shows flooding can reveal unreported problems, thus giving confidence to the modeller. Under-reporting of flooding is widespread; NWW are reported as thinking it may be as high as 80%. Hopefully most of these incidents will go to giving even greater justification to schemes that are already planned; if not, Authorities budgets are going to be strained.

Problems of roughness coefficients linked to whether or not to jet before a CCTV survey were discussed. The old adage "horses for courses" applies to both: the object is to construct an acceptable model that correctly represents the catchment and shows the problems. If the major cause of problems is excessive silt and it is subsequently removed, the model must be corrected to reflect its new clean condition. Time will show how often cleansing must be repeated and whether extra maintenance is better value than capital works.

Tame Division of Severn-Trent W.A. find that Drainage Area Study reports are much more valuable on the revenue side than initially expected.

Other points covered were:

1. What is the minimum information required for a study?
2. What size of sample should be looked at in detail when deciding on impervious areas? Concensus was 10-30%.
3. Always use too many raingauges rather than too few.
4. A good, secure, and plentiful type of site for raingauges was on top of petrol station canopies, if strong enough to allow access.