

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

2nd IWA Leading-Edge Conference & Exhibition onStrategic Asset Management

Proposal for a methodology to assess the technical performance of urban sewer systems

Adriana Cardoso, Sérgio Teixeira Coelho & José Matos

Introduction

Methodology

$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ Objectives – establishment of a system to be applied at engineering level:

- Objective, quantitative, systematized and standardized
- Using systems' data mathematical modelling or monitoring
- Based in performance measures defined for each relevant aspect to be assessed that allows to:
	- Collect system's information and translates it into performance, both in time and space, for extended period operational scenarios or in time and space, for extended period operational scenarios or loading factors
	- Classify performance
	- Evaluate performance evolution with time and compare among different systems
- Constitutes a flexible engineering tool to effectively support the management of urban drainage systems
- Supports decision making

I/I effects are relatively obvious but usually there is no objective information on its quantification, origin and economic impact;

- \mathbb{R}^3 Definition of performance indicators to assess I/I impacts:
	- *Hydraulic capacity* water level (PI_1) to be used at pipe scale.
	- Infiltration:
-
	- $\frac{\mathbf{Q}_{\rm inf}}{\mathbf{Q}_{\rm full}}$ (%) PI₂ proportion of the sewer full section flow
 $\mathbf{Q}_{\rm full}$ canacity used by the infiltration flow Q_{full} capacity used by the infiltration flow
	- $\frac{Q_{\rm inf}}{Q_{\rm avg}}$ (%) PI₃ infiltration flow as a percentage of the $Q_{\rm avg}$ daily mean dry weather flow Q_{avdwf} daily mean dry weather flow

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

infiltration:

 $\Gamma(m^3/\text{day}/(\text{cm.km})) - PI_4$ means infiltration flow
ner unit sewer wall area per unit sewer wall area areasewer longitudin al $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{inf}}$

- Inflow:

 $(%)$ – PI₅ proportion of the sewer full section flow
by used by the maximum inflow reaching the capacity used by the maximum inflow reaching the sewerfull maxinflow $\mathbf{Q}_{\rm full}$ Q

■ *Inflow:*

- $\frac{Q_{\text{inflow}}}{Q_{\text{inflow}}}$ (%) PI₆ inflow expressed as a percentage of the $\overline{Q}_{\text{inflow}}$ _{avdwf} daily mean dry weather flow Q_{avdu}
- $(%)$ PI₇ inflow expressed as a percentage of the nent runoff catchment runoff runoff V_{inflow} V_{max}

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ Definition of performance functions:

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ Definition of performance functions:

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Description of a case study

Objectives: Evaluate and quantify Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ effects on system performance;

International **Water Association**

Visual inspection

- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ domestic and stormwater systems
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ manholes, service connections and stormwater inlets;
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ Sulpho-Rodamine B (tracer).

Visual inspections

- 12.5 % of wrong service connections;
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ 14.3 % of stormwater connections;
- 6.5% of storm inlet connections;
- Discharges containing oils and fats in the stormwater system;
- Connections made directly in the pipes;
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ About 5% of the catchment area was contributing with storm water to the domestic sewer system.

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Flow and rain monitoring

Monitoring period
• one and a half year of measurements for domestic system and rainfall

Monitoring period

• two months of measurements for stormwater system

Asset Management

Flow and rain monitoring

> During rain events flow in the domestic system varies according
to rain intensity

TA

Asset Management

Mathematical modelling

Stormwater inflow to the domestic sewer during rainfall events

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Technical performance assessment

Hydraulic capacity – water level – pipe scale application $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

- \ge (a) Low intensity event Load factor = 3.4 **OPTIMUM**
- (b) Medium intensity event Load factor = 15 **GOOD**
- (c) High intensity event Load factor = 23 **UNACCEPTABLE**

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Technical performance assessment

I/I – PI_{2} , PI_{3} , PI_{4} , PI_{5} , PI_{6} , PI_{7} – catchment scale
application application

Discussion

- This system seems to be over designed all pipes have an acceptable performance (above 2) until a loading factor of 12;
- **Load factor of 40 there is flooding in the major part of the** system.
- **There are no individual pipes influencing significantly the** overall system's performance.
- **Infiltration has no significant consequences in both** aspects - hydraulic capacity (PI2) and economic (PI3) but regarding the structural aspect (PI4) the system presents an unacceptable performance.

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Discussion

- \mathbb{R}^2 The system presents an unacceptable performance regarding inflow for the three aspects analyzed (hydraulic, economic and structural):
	- The pipe section is significantly used by inflow with negative consequences in the hydraulic capacity (PI_5) , in accordance with the detailed hydraulic performance assessment (PI_1) .
	- There is a negative impact regarding the economic aspect $(PI₆)$.
	- Unacceptable stormwater volume reaches the domestic system, meaning that there is an excessive area wrongly connected to the domestic system, in accordance with results of the visual inspections of the structural condition $(PI₇)$.

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

Conclusions

- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ Impact of inflow into separate domestic systems can be very **significant** (even when there is a low number of wrong connections);
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ Spatial spreading of wrong connections increase the costs of their **detection.** (Important to have methodologies for planning correction measures).
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ Performance measures provide an objective and quantifiable way to:
	- measure the system performance and improvements
	- predict the benefits in performance provided by the intervention actions;
in a seculiarity of $\overline{\text{PL}}$ decay the same of labels data which we say that
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ The application of PI depends on available data, which means that:
	- can be applied at pipe or catchment scales;
the quality and uncertainty of PL require di
	- the quality and uncertainty of PI results depend on the quality and uncertainty of data used.
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ The presented methodology aims to support sewer systems rehabilitation by using PI, as a means of aggregating information on system characteristics and data from monitoring or modelling, and translate it into performance v
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ The methodology can support the decision on when and where to rehabilitate and must consider a set of PI and not only one, in order to give a global view with significant information.

Leading-Edge **Asset Management**

