

| Chilling and the second | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | |

LEGEND AREA 20 PRECINCT BOUNDARY 2 YEAR ARI ULTIMATE FLOOD EXTENTS 20 YEAR ARI ULTIMATE FLOOD EXTENTS 100 YEAR ARI ULTIMATE FLOOD EXTENTS PMF ULTIMATE FLOOD EXTENTS 100 YEAR ARI FLOOD EXTENTS (SYDNEY WATER ADOPTED MODEL) 3227 HEC-RAS SECTION & STATION NUMBER PARK SPORTING FIELD

FIGURE 6

ADVANCE COPY ONLY NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

| EA 20 | PRECINCT, | ROUSE | HILL |
|-------|-----------|-------|------|
| | , | | |

| 00 Y | /EAR ARI & PN | /IF ULTIMATE F | LOOD EXTENTS |
|-------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| C - F | RAS RIVER ST | ATION LAYOUT | AND NUMBERS |

| PLAN NO. 8622/SW06 | 6 C |
|-----------------------|--------|
| FILE No. 8622SW06 | |
| SHEET 6 OF 10 | SHEETS |









| \frown | |
|----------|--------------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | LEGEND |
| | AREA 20 PRECINCT BOUNDARY |
| | 100 YEAR ARI FLOOD HAZARD CATEGORIES |
| | Hazard |
| | Low |
| | Medium |
| | and a second |
| | nign |
| | Very High |
| | Extreme |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| FIGURE | 9 |
|--------|---|
|--------|---|

Ŵ

| ADVANCE COPY ON | ILY |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION | N |
|) PRECINCT, ROUSE HILL | PLAN №. 8622/SW |

| PLAN N 862 | 。 2/\$ | SW09 | Э В | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------|--|
| FILE No 8622SW | /09 | | | |
| SHEET | 9 | OF 10 | SHEETS | |



| ~ | |
|--------|---------------|
| | |
| \sum | |
| | |
| × × | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | LEGEN |
| THE | Af |
| | PMF FLOOD HAZ |
| 目目目 | |
| | |
| HE. | - |
| THE | |
| | المحصار |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| AF | REA 20 PRECINCT BOUNDARY | |
|----|--------------------------|--|
| | Hazard | |
| | Low | |
| | Medium | |
| | High | |
| | Very High | |
| | Extreme | |
| | | |
| | | |

Ŵ

FIGURE 10

| ADVANCE COPY ON | ILY |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION | N |
| 20 PRECINCT, ROUSE HILL | PLAN NO. 8622/SW1 |

PMF FLOOD HAZARD CATEGORY MAP

| PLAN N 862 | 。 2/S | SW1(| 0 B | |
|-------------------|----------|-------|--------|--|
| FILE No 8622SW | /10 | | | |
| SHEET | 10 | OF 10 | SHEETS | |

Attachment A

Indicative Layout Plan





ALEX AVENUE

OFIEL

Attachment B

Riparian Corridor Extents Within Area 20



Figure 3 Riparian categories within Area 20

Attachment C

Condition Assessment And Performance Evaluation Of Bioretention Systems - Practice Note 1: In Situ Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity



CONDITION ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF BIORETENTION SYSTEMS

PRACTICE NOTE 1: *In Situ* Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity

Belinda Hatt, Sebastien Le Coustumer April 2008

The Facility for Advancing Water Biofiltration (FAWB) aims to deliver its research findings in a variety of forms in order to facilitate widespread and successful implementation of biofiltration technologies. This Practice Note for *In Situ* Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity is the first in a series of Practice Notes being developed to assist practitioners with the assessment of construction and operation of biofiltration systems.

Disclaimer: Information contained in this Practice Note is believed to be correct at the time of publication, however neither the Facility for Advancing Water Bioifltration nor its industry partners accept liability for any loss or damage resulting from its use.

1. SCOPE OF THE DOCUMENT

This Practice Note for *In Situ* Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity is designed to complement FAWB's Guidelines for Soil Filter Media in Bioretention Systems, Version 2.01 (visit <u>http://www.monash.edu.au/fawb/publications/index.html</u> for a copy of these guidelines). However, the recommendations contained within this document are more widely applicable to assessing the hydraulic conductivity of filter media in existing biofiltration systems.

For new systems, this Practice Note *does not* remove the need to conduct laboratory testing of filter media prior to installation.

2. DETERMINATION OF HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY

The recommended method for determining *in situ* hydraulic conductivity uses a single ring infiltrometer under constant head. The single ring infiltrometer consists of a small plastic or metal ring that is driven 50 mm into the soil filter media. It is a constant head test that is conducted for two different pressure heads (50 mm and 150 mm). The head is kept constant during all the experiments by pouring water into the ring. The frequency of readings of the volume poured depends on the filter media, but typically varies from 30 seconds to 5 minutes. The experiment is stopped when the infiltration rate is considered steady (i.e., when the volume poured per time interval remains constant for at least 30 minutes). This method has been used extensively (e.g. Reynolds and Elrick, 1990; Youngs *et al.*, 1993).

Note: This method measures the hydraulic conductivity at the surface of the soil filter media. In most cases, it is this top layer which controls the hydraulic conductivity of the system as a whole (i.e., the underlying drainage layer has a flow capacity several orders of magnitude higher than the filter media), as it is this layer where fine sediment will generally be deposited to form a "clogging layer". However this shallow test would not be appropriate for systems where the controlling layer

is not the surface layer (e.g. where migration of fine material down through the filter media has caused clogging within the media). In this case, a 'deep ring' method is required; for further information on this method, please consult FAWB's report "Hydraulic performance of biofilter systems for stormwater management: lessons from a field study", available at www.monash.edu.au/fawb/publications/index.html.

2.1 Selection of monitoring points

For bioretention systems with a surface area less than 50 m², *in situ* hydraulic conductivity testing should be conducted at three points that are spatially distributed (Figure 1). For systems with a surface area greater than 50 m², an extra monitoring point should be added for every additional 100 m². It is *essential* that the monitoring point is flat and level. Vegetation should not be included in monitoring points.



Figure 1. Spatially distributed monitoring points

2.2 Apparatus

The following is required:

- 100 mm diameter PVC rings with a height of at least 220 mm. The bottom edge of the ring should be bevelled and the inside of the ring should be marked to indicate 50 mm and 150 mm above the filter media surface (Figure 2).
- 40 L water
- 100 mL, 250 mL and 1000 mL measuring cylinders
- Stopwatch
- Thermometer



- Measuring tape
- Spirit level
- Hammer
- Block of wood, approximately 200 x 200 mm



Figure 2. Diagram of single ring infiltrometer

2.3 Procedure

- a. Carefully scrape away any surface covering (e.g. mulch, gravel, leaves) *without disturbing* the soil filter media surface (Figure 3b).
- b. Locate the ring on the surface of the soil (Figure 3c), and then place the block of wood on top of the ring. Gently tap with the hammer to drive the ring 50 mm into the filter media (Figure 3d).
 Use the spirit level to check that the ring is level.

Note: It is *essential* that this the ring is driven in slowly and carefully to minimise disturbance of the filter media profile.

- c. Record the initial water temperature.
- d. Fill the 1000 mL measuring cylinder.
- e. Using a different pouring apparatus, slowly fill the ring to a ponding depth of 50 mm, taking care to minimise disturbance of the soil surface (Figure 3f). Start the stopwatch when the water level reaches 50 mm.
- f. Using the 1000 mL measuring cylinder, maintain the water level at 50 mm (Figure 3g). After 30 seconds, record the volume poured.
- g. Maintain the water level at 50 mm, recording the time interval and volume required to do so.

Note: The time interval between recordings will be determined by the infiltration capacity of the filter media. For fast draining media, the time interval should not be greater than one minute however, for slow draining media, the time between recordings may be up to five minutes.

Note: The smallest measuring cylinder that can pour the volume required to maintain a constant water level for the measured time interval should be used for greater accuracy. For example, if the volume poured over one minute is 750 mL, then the 1000 mL measuring cylinder should be used. Similarly, if the volume poured is 50 mL, then the 100 mL measuring cylinder should be used.

- h. Continue to repeat Step f until the infiltration rate is steady i.e., the volume poured per time interval remains constant for at least 30 minutes.
- i. Fill the ring to a ponding depth of 150 mm (Figure 3h). Restart the stopwatch. Repeat steps e g for this ponding depth.

Note: Since the filter media is already saturated, the time required to reach steady infiltration should be less than for the first ponding depth.

- j. Record the final water temperature.
- k. Enter the temperature, time, and volume data into a calculation spreadsheet (see "Practice Note 1_Single Ring Infiltration Test_Example Calculations.xls", available at www.monash.edu.au/fawb/publications/index.html, as an example).

2.4 Calculations

In order to calculate K_{fs} a 'Gardner's' behaviour for the soil should be assumed (Gardner, 1958 in Youngs *et al.*, 1993):

$$K(h) = K_{fs} e^{\alpha h} \qquad \qquad \text{Eqn. 1}$$

where K is the hydraulic conductivity, α is a soil pore structure parameter (large for sands and small for clay), and h is the negative pressure head. K_{fs} is then found using the following analytical expression (for a steady flow) (Reynolds and Elrick, 1990):

$$K_{fs} = \frac{G}{a} \left(\frac{Q_2 - Q_1}{H_2 - H_1} \right)$$
 Eqn. 2

where *a* is the ring radius, H_1 and H_2 are the first (50 mm) and second (150 mm) pressure heads, respectively, Q_1 and Q_2 are the steady flows for the first and second pressure heads, respectively, and *G* is a shape factor estimated as:

$$G = 0.316 \frac{d}{a} + 0.184$$
 Eqn. 3

where d is the depth of insertion of the ring and a is the ring radius.

G is nearly independent of soil hydraulic conductivity (i.e. K_{fs} and α) and ponding, if the ponding is greater than 50 mm.





Figure 3. Measuring hydraulic conductivity

The possible limitations of the test are (Reynolds *et al.*, 2000): (1) the relatively small sample size due to the size of the ring, (2) soil disturbance during installation of the ring (compaction of the soil), and (3) possible edge flow during the experiments.

3 INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

This test method has been shown to be relatively comparable to laboratory test methods (Le Coustumer *et al.*, 2008), taking into account the inherent variability in hydraulic conductivity testing and the heterogeneity of natural soil-based filter media. While correlation between the two test methods is low, results are not statistically different. In light of this, laboratory and field results are deemed comparable if they are within 50% of each other. In the same way, replicate field results are considered comparable if they differ by less than 50%. Where this is not the case, this is likely to be due to a localised inconsistency in the filter media, therefore additional measurement should be conducted at different monitoring points until comparable results are achieved. If this is not achieved, then an area-weighted average value may need to be calculated.

4 MONITORING FREQUENCY

Field testing of hydraulic conductivity should be carried out at least twice: (1) One month following commencement of operation, and (2) In the second year of operation to assess the impact of vegetation on hydraulic conductivity. Following this, hydraulic conductivity testing should be conducted every two years or when there has been a significant change in catchment characteristics (e.g., construction without appropriate sediment control).

REFERENCES

- Gardner, W. R. (1958). Some steady-state solutions of the unsaturated moisture flow equation with application to evaporation from a water table. *Soil Science* **85**: 228-232.
- Le Coustumer, S., T. D. Fletcher, A. Deletic and M. Potter (2008). Hydraulic performance of biofilter systems for stormwater management: lessons from a field study, Melbourne Water Corporation.
- Reynolds, W. D., B. T. Bowman, R. R. Brunke, C. F. Drury and C. S. Tan (2000). Comparison of tension infiltrometer, pressure infiltrometer, and soil core estimates of saturated hydraulic conductivity. *Soil Science Society of America journal* **64**(2): 478-484.
- Reynolds, W. D. and D. E. Elrick (1990). Ponded infiltration from a single ring: Analysis of steady flow. Soil Science Society of America journal **54**: 1233-1241.
- Youngs, E. G., D. E. Elrick and W. D. Reynolds (1993). Comparison of steady flows from infiltration rings in "Green and Ampt" and "Gardner" soils. *Water Resources Research* **29**(6): 1647-1650.

11((())))))))

Single Ring Infiltration Test

Site: _____

Date: _____

| Constant water level = 50 mm | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Time (min) | Volume (mL) | Q (mL/s) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| Constant water level = 150 mm | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Time (min) | Volume (mL) | Q (mL/s) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Attachment D

XP-RAFTS Ultimate Development Results – 100 Year ARI, 120 Minute Storm File: J:\8622W\XP-RAFTS\8622RA_7(JWP_Ult_Final).out 28/10/2010, 7:58:13 AM

| ROUTING INCREMENT (MINS) | = | 1.0 | 0 |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------|
| STORM DURATION (MINS) | = | 120 | |
| RETURN PERIOD (YRS) | = | 100 | |
| BX | = | 1.000 | 0 |
| TOTAL OF FIRST SUB-AREAS | (ha) | = | 407.84 |
| TOTAL OF SECOND SUB-AREAS | S (ha) | = | 691.27 |
| TOTAL OF ALL SUB-AREAS (| ha) ́ | = | 1099.10 |
| - | - | | |

| SUN | MARY OF CA | ATCHMEN | T AND RAINFAL | L DATA | | | | |
|---------|------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|
| Link | Catch. | Area | slope | % Impervious | Pern | В | | Link |
| Label | #1 | #2 | #1 #2 | #1 #2 | #1 #2 | #1 | #2 | NO. |
| | (ha) | | (%) | (%) | | | | |
| 58.0 | 8.465 1 | L2.439 | 2.500 2.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0402 | .0035 | 1.000 |
| 58.01 | 2.333 | 8.749 | 2.500 2.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0206 | .0029 | 1.001 |
| 58.02 | 6.236 | 8.477 | 1.500 1.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0442 | .0037 | 1.002 |
| 58.03 | 22.735 1 | L4.411 | 1.800 1.800 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0791 | .0044 | 1.003 |
| 58.04 | 26.818 2 | 24.936 | 1.400 1.400 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0978 | .0067 | 1.004 |
| 58.05 | 13.723 | 32.010 | 3.300 3.300 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0450 | .0050 | 1.005 |
| 60.0 | 8.168 2 | 24.407 | 1.900 1.900 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0452 | .0057 | 2.000 |
| 58.05B | .00001 | 0.000 | 1.000 0.000 | 5.000 0.000 | .025 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.006 |
| 59.0 | 7.691 2 | 28.608 | 2.400 2.400 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0390 | .0055 | 3.000 |
| 59.01 | 7.300 2 | 23.847 | 1.800 1.800 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0438 | .0058 | 3,001 |
| 62 0 | 7 633 2 | 21 444 | 2 200 2 200 | 5 000 100 0 | 025 015 | 0406 | 0049 | 4 000 |
| 58 06 | 11 665 2 | 25 183 | 1 400 1 400 | 5 000 100 0 | 025 015 | 0634 | 0067 | 1 007 |
| 61 01 | 7 588 1 | 19 770 | 2 800 2 800 | 5 000 100 0 | 025 015 | 0359 | 0042 | 5 000 |
| 58 06B | 00001 | | | 5 000 0 000 | | 0 000 | 0 000 | 1 008 |
| 58 064 | 2 240 | 0.000 | 3 000 0 000 | 5 000 0 000 | | 0184 | 0.000 | 1 009 |
| 58 07 | 0 210 | 7 071 | 2 200 2 200 | 5 000 100 0 | 025 015 | 0148 | 0.000 | 1 010 |
| 64 0 | 8 051 1 | 15 061 | 2 700 2 700 | 5 000 100.0 | 025 015 | 0377 | .0020 | 6 000 |
| 62 0 | 2 0/5 1 | | 2.700 2.700 | 5 000 100.0 | 025 015 | .03/7 | .0037 | 7 000 |
| 65 0 | 6 368 1 | 12 151 | 2.000 2.000 | 5 000 100.0 | 025 015 | .0302 | .0040 | 8 000 |
| | 1 401 (| | | 5.000 ± 00.0 | .025 .015 | .02.97 | .0031 | 1 011 |
| 50.00 | 10 700 1 | 10 704 | $3.000 \ 3.000$ | 5.000 ± 00.0 | .023 .013 | .0144 | .0007 | 1 012 |
| 56.09 | LO./OZ 1 | 17 174 | 2 000 2 000 | 5.000 ± 00.0 | | .0090 | .0031 | 1.012 |
| 66.01 | 3.103 J | L/.424 | $3.900 \ 3.900$ | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0247 | .0033 | 9.000 |
| 66.01 | | L4.524 | $3.700 \ 3.700$ | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0462 | .0051 | 9.001 |
| 00.02 | 4.775 | 2.945 | 5.700 5.700 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0245 | .0014 | 9.002 |
| 38.10 | 6.109 | 0.462 | 1.900 1.900 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0389 | .0029 | 1.013 |
| 1.00 | .00001 | 9.370 | 3.600 3.600 | | .025 .015 | 0.000 | .0025 | 10.00 |
| 3.00 | 1.760 | 9.950 | 3.900 3.900 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0142 | .0025 | 11.00 |
| 3.01 | 0.5160 | 2.920 | 2.400 2.400 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0096 | .0017 | 11.00 |
| BP15.00 | 0.2460 | 1.240 | 1.800 1.800 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0075 | .0012 | 12.00 |
| BP16.00 | 0.2600 | 1.500 | 3.100 3.100 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0059 | .0010 | 13.00 |
| MRL.00 | 0.7200 | 4.110 | 1.000 1.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .01/6 | .0031 | 14.00 |
| MRI.UI | 0.1600 (| 1.9200 | 1.000 1.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0081 | .0014 | 14.00 |
| MR2.00 | 0.1900 | 1.090 | 1.000 1.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0088 | .0016 | 15.00 |
| MR2.01 | 0.1300 (| 0.7400 | 1.000 1.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0072 | .0013 | 15.00 |
| 58.11 | 5.930 (| 0.1210 | 3.200 3.200 | 0.000 100.0 | .035 .015 | .0465 | .0003 | 1.014 |
| 4.00 | .00001 | 5.810 | 4.700 4.700 | 0.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | 0.000 | .0017 | 16.00 |
| 4.01 | 0.8100 | 4.5/0 | 4./00 4./00 | $5.000\ 100.0$ | .025 .015 | .0087 | .0015 | 16.00 |
| 5.00 | 0.6900 | 3.940 | 2.000 2.000 | $5.000\ 100.0$ | .025 .015 | .0122 | .0021 | 17.00 |
| 6.00 | 0.5450 | 3.090 | 4.500 4.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0072 | .0013 | 18.00 |
| 58.12 | 3.150 (| 0.0640 | 3.500 3.500 | $0.000\ 100.0$ | .035 .015 | .0320 | .0002 | 1.015 |
| 7.00 | 2.270 1 | L2.840 | 3.300 3.300 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0176 | .0031 | 19.00 |
| 58.12B | 2.750 (| 0.0560 | 4.000 4.000 | 0.000 100.0 | .035 .015 | .0279 | .0002 | 1.016 |
| 10.00 | 0.2570 | 1.454 | 3.500 3.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0055 | .0010 | 20.00 |
| 8.00 | 1.740 | 9.860 | 5.200 5.200 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0123 | .0022 | 21.00 |
| 8.01 | 2.910 1 | L6.490 | 5.500 5.500 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0156 | .0027 | 21.00 |
| 8.02A | 0.4310 | 2.440 | 4.800 4.800 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0062 | .0011 | 22.00 |
| 8.02 | 5.000 (| 0.5560 | 3.000 3.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0279 | .0006 | 21.00 |
| 9.00 | 2.270 1 | L2.840 | 3.300 3.300 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0176 | .0031 | 23.00 |
| 9.01 | 3.640 (| 0.4040 | 3.000 3.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0237 | .0005 | 23.00 |
| Ang.Sch | 0.8100 | 4.590 | 6.000 6.000 | 5.000 100.0 | .025 .015 | .0077 | .0013 | 24.00 |

Page: 1

| File: J | :\8622W\X | P-RAFTS | \8622RA | _7(JWP | _Ult_Fi | nal).ou | ut 28/ | 10/2010 | , 7:58: | 13 AM | 4 | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| 11.00 58.13 BP17.00 12.00 58.13B RHRP 58.14 58.15 69.0 70.0 58.16 71.0 58.16 71.0 58.17 72.0 58.18 73.0 58.19 74.0 75.0 75.01 58.20 58.21 77.0 58.21 77.0 58.22 1.28 | $\begin{array}{c} 1.320\\ 3.400\\ 0.1890\\ 1.120\\ 0.6260\\ 4.570\\ 22.590\\ 5.420\\ .00001\\ 6.204\\ 6.936\\ 13.834\\ 5.798\\ 16.070\\ 7.633\\ 7.521\\ 3.854\\ 2.057\\ 7.362\\ 4.961\\ 1.137\\ 0.4842\\ 10.187\\ 6.321\\ 5.365\\ 7.490\\ 4.338\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 7.480\\ 0.0690\\ 1.070\\ 6.330\\ 3.550\\ 0.0930\\ 2.510\\ 0.1110\\ 0.000\\ 8.646\\ 12.615\\ 16.284\\ 13.531\\ 23.196\\ 22.107\\ 5.910\\ 7.630\\ 1.877\\ 12.889\\ 8.978\\ 6.703\\ 0.8056\\ 10.717\\ 6.730\\ 18.643\\ 10.888\\ 11.330\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 6.300\\ 5.600\\ 3.000\\ 3.400\\ 2.500\\ 4.400\\ 8.500\\ 4.600\\ 2.700\\ 2.800\\ 3.000\\ 2.800\\ 3.000\\ 3.000\\ 3.400\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.400\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.500\\ 4.200\\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 6.300\\ 5.600\\ 3.400\\ 2.500\\ 4.400\\ 8.500\\ 4.600\\ 0.000\\ 2.700\\ 2.800\\ 2.700\\ 3.000\\ 2.800\\ 3.000\\ 2.800\\ 3.000\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.400\\ 3.200\\ 3.400\\ 0.5.800\\ 4.100\\ 5.400\\ 6.900\\ 2.700\\ 3.200\\ 3.500\\ 4.200\\ \end{array}$ | 5.000 | <pre>) 100.0</pre> | .025 .035 .025 .025 .025 .025 .025 .025 .025 .02 | .015 .0 .015 .0 .005 .005 | 0096 .0 0263 .0 0120 .0 0151 .0 0120 .0 0120 .0 0120 .0 0120 .0 0124 .0 0370 .0 0370 .0 0329 .0 0329 .0 0342 .0 0342 .0 0347 .0 0354 .0 0238 .0 0095 .0 0426 .0 0355 .0 0426 .0 0319 .0 0218 .0 0219 .0 | 017 002 009 021 018 002 008 002 008 002 008 002 0033 037 035 047 038 024 012 028 024 012 028 021 022 005 031 005 031 002 002 002 002 002 002 002 002 002 00 | 25.00 1.017 26.00 27.00 28.00 1.018 29.00 1.019 1.020 30.00 31.00 1.021 32.00 1.022 33.00 1.023 34.00 1.024 35.00 36.00 37.00 36.00 1.025 1.026 38.00 1.027 1.028 | |
| Link Label 58.0 58.02 58.03 58.04 58.05 59.0 59.01 62.0 58.06 61.01 58.06B 58.06A 58.06 61.01 58.06B 58.06A 58.07 64.0 63.0 65.0 58.08 58.09 66.0 66.01 66.02 58.10 1.00 3.00 BP15.00 BP15.00 BP16.00 MR1.00 MR1.01 MR2.01 58.11 4.00 4.01 5.00 58.12 7.00 | Average Intensit (mm/h) 44.640 | Init. y #1 15.00 15. | Loss #2 m) 1.500 | Cont. I #1 (mm/l 2.500 (2.500 (2 | -055 #2 1) 0.0000 0.000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.0000 0.00000 0.000000 | Excess #1 (mm 70.113 | Rain #2 87.780 | Peak Inflow (m^3/s) 7.701 10.734 13.734 14.313 14.755 23.563 13.349 35.952 15.690 (23.595 11.999 72.871 11.370 48.235 48.662 50.803 9.054 7.249 8.074 60.063 63.997 10.086 19.290 (21.667 68.298 4.800 5.543 6.881 0.7093 0.8738 2.235 (2.235 5.693 2.177 0.5897 0.9908 73.579 3.086 5.693 2.177 1.809 76.312 7.104 | Time Peak Peak 2 35.00 2 35.00 3 3 | $\begin{array}{c} \text{Li}\\ \text{min}\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$ | nk g s 000 000 000 000 000 000 00 | |

| File: J:\ | .8622w∖xi | p-rafts\8622r | A_7(JWP_Ult_F | inal).out 2 | 3/10/2010, | 7:58:13 AM |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| File: J:\ 58.12B 10.00 8.00 8.01 8.02A 8.02 9.00 9.01 Ang.Sch 11.00 58.13 8P17 00 | 8622w\xi 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 44.640 | P-RAFTS\8622R 15.00 1.500 15.00 1.500 | A_7(JWP_Ult_F 2.500 0.000 2.500 0.000 | inal).out 23 70.113 87.78 <td>3/10/2010, 30 78.381 30 0.8560 30 5.602 30 14.721 30 1.454 30 7.104 30 2.702 30 2.702 30 4.310 30 87.598 30 0.6376</td> <td>7:58:13 AM 65.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 32.00 2.000 35.00 1.500 32.00 0.000 37.00 0.000 33.00 0.000 35.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 65.00 0.000 32.00 0.000</td> | 3/10/2010, 30 78.381 30 0.8560 30 5.602 30 14.721 30 1.454 30 7.104 30 2.702 30 2.702 30 4.310 30 87.598 30 0.6376 | 7:58:13 AM 65.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 32.00 2.000 35.00 1.500 32.00 0.000 37.00 0.000 33.00 0.000 35.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 65.00 0.000 32.00 0.000 |
| BP17.00 12.00 13.00 58.13B RHRP 58.14 58.15 69.0 70.0 58.16 71.0 58.17 72.0 58.18 | $\begin{array}{r} 44.640\\$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} 2.500 & 0.000\\$ | 70.113 87.78 70.113 87.78 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} 32.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 70.00 & 0.000 \\ 40.00 & 0.000 \\ 80.00 & 0.000 \\ 81.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 35.00 & 0.000 \\ 91.00 & 0.000 \\ 91.00 & 0.000 \\ 98.00 & 0.000 \\ 98.00 & 0.000 \end{array}$ |
| 73.0 58.19 74.0 75.0 76.0 75.01 58.20 58.21 77.0 58.22 1.28 | $\begin{array}{r} 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\\ 44.640\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c} 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\\ 2.500 & 0.000\end{array}$ | 70.113 87.78 70.113 87.78 | 30 4.840 30 99.655 30 8.308 30 5.879 30 3.814 30 10.063 30 102.95 30 102.92 30 10.999 30 104.50 30 105.11 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |

SUMMARY OF BASIN RESULTS

| Link | Time | Peak Ti | ne Peak | Total | | Basin | |
|---------|-------|-------------|------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Label | to | Inflow to | o Outflow | Inflow | Vol. | Vol. | Stage |
| | Peak | (m^3/s) Pea | ak (m^3/s) | (m^3) | Avail | Used | Used |
| 58.02 | 40.00 | 13.73 51.0 | 00 8.925 | 37980.2 | 0.0000 | 11192.8 | 70.420 |
| 58.03 | 59.00 | 14.31 120 | .0 4.739 | 66762.5 | 0.0000 | 42322.2 | 68.183 |
| 58.06 | 40.00 | 72.87 51.0 | 00 44.65 | 251315. | 0.0000 | 47295.1 | 53.607 |
| 66.02 | 39.00 | 21.67 106 | .0 2.850 | 49829.0 | 0.0000 | 32514.1 | 48.028 |
| Ang.Sch | 32.00 | 2.702 36.0 | 00 2.061 | 4596.0 | 0.0000 | 1471.9 | 44.105 |

SUMMARY OF BASIN OUTLET RESULTS

| Link | NO. | S/D | Dia | Width | Ріре | Pipe |
|---------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|--------|--------|
| Label | of | Factor | (m) | (m) | Length | Slope |
| | 1 0 | (m) 1 000 | (m) | | (m) | |
| 58.02 | 1.0 | 1.000 | | 0.000 | 5.000 | 3.000 |
| 58.03 | 1.0 | 1.000 | | 0.000 | 31.600 | 0.2000 |
| 58.06 | 1.0 | 1.000 | | 0.000 | 20.000 | 0.2000 |
| 66.02 | 1.0 | 1.000 | | 0.000 | 20.000 | 0.2000 |
| Ang.Sch | 1.0 | 1.000 | | 0.000 | 20.000 | 0.2000 |

| | SUMMARY O | F CHANN | EL/FLOO | DWAY DAT | A AND I | RESULT | | |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|--------|-------|---------|
| Link | Ave. | Ave. | Flow | Max. | NO. | Pipe | Pipe | Pipe |
| Label | Vel. | Rough. | Depth | Flow | of | Dia. | slope | Flow |
| | (m/s) | (n) | (m) | (m^3/s) | Pipes | (m) | (%) | (m3^/s) |
| 58.0 | 0.631 | .0475 | 1.505 | 6.843 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.01 | 0.698 | .0463 | 1.609 | 9.970 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.02 | 0.683 | .0468 | 1.559 | 8.583 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.03 | 0.594 | .0492 | 1.400 | 4.719 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.04 | 0.749 | .0458 | 1.663 | 12.181 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.05 | 0.914 | .0444 | 1.869 | 23.072 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 58.05B | 0.966 | .0437 | 2.016 | 31.867 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | | |

| File: J:\ | \8622w\x | P-RAFTS | \8622RA | _7(JWP_U | lt_Fin | al).out | 28/10/2 | 2010, 7:58: | 13 AM |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|-------|
| 59.0 58.06 58.06B 58.06A 58.07 58.08 58.09 66.0 66.01 58.10 58.10 58.12 58.12 58.12 58.12 58.13 58.14 58.13 58.14 58.14 58.15 58.16 58.16 58.16 58.16 58.17 58.18 58.19 75.0 58.20 | $\begin{array}{c} 1.46\\ 1.11\\ 1.13\\ 1.13\\ 1.14\\ 1.17\\ 1.22\\ 2.74\\ 0.886\\ 0.935\\ 0.847\\ 0.852\\ 0.754\\ 0.687\\ 0.957\\ 0.954\\ 0.965\\ 0.980\\ 0.985\\ 0.986\\ 1.27\\ 0.9921\end{array}$ | .0600 .0433 .0432 .0432 .0431 .0429 .0428 .0600 .0660 .0656 .0656 .0655 .0647 .0654 .0654 .0654 .0653 .0652 .0652 .0652 .0652 | 4.750 2.138 2.175 2.178 2.200 2.281 2.213 3.675 3.594 3.612 3.737 3.756 3.987 4.100 3.781 3.781 3.812 3.844 3.850 2.450 3.875 | $\begin{array}{c} 13.345\\ 44.655\\ 48.173\\ 48.409\\ 50.774\\ 58.299\\ 63.911\\ 9.634\\ 19.006\\ 68.208\\ 73.490\\ 76.178\\ 78.131\\ 86.684\\ 87.420\\ 90.025\\ 89.696\\ 93.688\\ 96.285\\ 98.650\\ 99.308\\ 5.672\\ 102.38\\ 102.38\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\ 1.0\\$ | $\begin{array}{c} 0.000\\ 0.$ | $\begin{array}{c} 0.000\\ 0.$ | 0.000 | |
| 58.22 | 1.00 | .0650 | 3.887 | 102.65 | 1.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |

| Run | completed | at: | 28th | October | 2010 | 7:56:32 |
|-----|-----------|-----|------|---------|------|---------|
|-----|-----------|-----|------|---------|------|---------|

Attachment E

Area 20 Precinct Climate Change Assessment



Cart of Cart

ABN 67 002 318 621

Our Ref: 8622 Climate Change Assessment.doc DG.dg

J. WYNDHAM PRINCE

15 June 2010

Department of Planning PO Box 1457 Parramatta NSW 2124

Attn: Mr Lee Mulvey

Subject: Area 20 Precinct – Rouse Hill Climate Change Assessment

Dear Lee,

The following information is offered as an explanation of our investigations into the anticipated impacts of Climate Change on the performance of the Drainage System proposed for the Area 20 Precinct. The objective of this assessment is to provide information on the possible impacts of Climate Change.

BACKGROUND TO CLIMATE CHANGE ASSESSMENTS

When undertaking a risk assessment into the impact of flooding on urban infrastructure, as a consequence of Climate Change predictions, it is necessary to quantify the possible changes in rainfall intensity and assess the impact that these changes may have on the catchment hydrology. In the absence of specific quantifiable guidelines from Blacktown City Council (BCC) the primary reference sources agreed to, for this assessment, are:

- 1. *NSW Climate Change Action Plan: Summary of Climate Change Impacts Sydney Region, October 2008*, prepared by the NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change;
- 2. Practical Consideration of Climate Change Floodplain Risk Management Guideline, October 2007, prepared by the NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change;
- 3. *Climate Change in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment, 2007*, prepared by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, were adopted as the primary reference documents for this assessment; and
- 4. Climate Change in Australia Observed Changes and Projections, October 2007, prepared by Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology.

Prior to assessing the estimated impacts of Climate Change on the Area 20 Precinct, it is necessary to compare the various recommended increases to Rainfall Intensities identified in these documents, determine the most appropriate Rainfall Intensity increase and apply it to the hydrologic assessment for the site.

This process is consistent with the "Management Strategies For Future Development" outlined in Reference 2. Table 1 summarises the State and Federal Government approaches to accounting for changes to predicted rainfall intensities and storm volumes associated with Climate Change. All documents predict increases in peak rainfall intensity with an associated increase in storm

runoff volume. However the overall Average Annual Rainfall for the region is anticipated to reduce, whilst summer rainfall is predicted to increase. Drawing a direct comparison between each of the predictions, and relating a conclusion to a predicted increase in rainfall intensity is not as straightforward as it may seem and it has been necessary to relate the stated volumetric predictions to a more tangible Average Recurrence Interval (see Reference 2).

| TABLE 1 - Comparison of the Various Climate Change Strategies |
|---|
|---|

| Reference | Rainfall Intensity | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| Climate Change Impacts - Sydney Region, 2008 (DECC) | Summer runoff depths estimated to increase by 0% to 26% Summer rainfall volume projected to increase by 20% to 50% | Hydrologic change assessment based on seasonal variation estimates. The summer runoff depth increase is the largest. |
| Practical Consideration of Climate Change – Flood Risk Management, 2007 (DECC) | Sensitivity Analysis based on increases of: 10% peak rainfall & vol.; 20% peak rainfall & vol.; 30% peak rainfall & vol. Table of increases in Extreme Rainfall Intensities (40-yr, 24-hr) based on %age change in Intensity and Storm Volume. | This approach relies on a risk analysis based on the potential impacts of the various increases. The lowest value with an acceptable An Av Damage is then adopted. Consideration of the AAD where this value is exceeded must be included and a strategy to accommodate the additional risk identified. |
| Climate Change in the H-N Catchment, 2007 (CSIRO) Climate Change in Australia, 2007 (BofN) | Projected max. Change in the 40-yr, 24-hr rainfall by: 2030 – 12%; 2070 – 10%. General increase in daily rainfall intensities in | Total annual rainfall is predicted to decline by about 80 mm with the possibility of seasonal increases in extreme rainfall events. Expected volumetric change is to be minimal but extreme daily |
| | summer only. | rainial is expected to increase. |

A summary of the information contained in the above reference documents is outlined below.

- All references agree on a general increase in summer rainfall volume;
- Reference 1 determines the summer daily volumetric runoff depth to increase by 26%;
- Reference 2 refers to a sensitivity analysis of Climate Change based on the risks associated with an Annual Average Damage analysis to determine the appropriate Flood Planning Levels, which can then be related to an Average Recurrence Interval (ARI). This approach accommodates a 10%, 20% and 30% increase in the rainfall intensities to determine revised flow rates and runoff depths;

• Reference 3 is the only reference to provide a quantifiable relationship between Climate Change and rainfall intensity for a particular Average Recurrence Interval (ARI). It estimates that the maximum projected change in rainfall intensity for the larger scale storms (40-yr, 24-hr) is about 12%.

These four (4) references were prepared as background documents to assist with Floodplain Risk Management planning. They provide limited guidance with respect to assessing the possible impacts of Climate Change on new urban developments and the costs associated with the subsequent increase in the land required for local flood control.

NOTE: Based on the 12% increase predicted in Reference 3, the rainfall intensities in the existing XP-RAFTS hydrologic computer models, prepared to represent Caddies Creek catchment, were 'conservatively' increased by 15%. The resulting increase in runoff depth, for the 100-yr ARI critical storm, was determined as approximately 25%, which approximates the summer seasonal runoff depth increases of 26% predicted in Reference 1.

DISCUSSION

The Sensitivity Analyses outlined above provides information to assist in determining appropriate parameters to be used when considering the impact of an anticipated increase in rainfall intensities as a result of Climate Change predictions. A discussion of the results follows:

- The peak discharge generated by a 15% increase in rainfall intensity approximates a peak discharge rate midway between the existing peak discharge and that generated by a 30% increase in rainfall intensity. Reference 2 predicts a 12% rainfall intensity increase by 2030 with a reduction to a 10% increase by 2100, over present day rainfall intensities. Further, a 15% increase in rainfall intensity results in a 25% increase in the peak runoff depth. This increase in peak runoff depth approximates the 26% increase anticipated in the seasonal summer runoff depth referred to in Reference 1.
- In our opinion, adoption of a 15% increase in rainfall intensities provides a reasonable estimate of CCI.
- Drainage Reserve / Easements Numbers 1 and 2 (Refer Plan 8622SW04) can accommodate the impact of climate change without increasing the depth of flow above 200 mm or the velocity depth product above 0.4.
- Drainage Reserve Numbers 3 and 4 can accommodate the impact of climate change within the first 200 mm of the available 500 mm of freeboard.

RECOMMENDATION

Rainfall Intensity – increased by 15% for the 100-year critical storm in consideration of the possible impact of Climate Change. Table 5 compares land requirements for a Drainage Strategy that matches the existing peak flow rates and one which includes a 15% increase in rainfall intensity utilising both Options 1 and 2 to control peak discharges.

Trunk Channel Waterway Area – profile to be based on a 15% increase in rainfall intensity. The capacity of the channel must contain the runoff generated by a 15% increase in the 100-year peak flow rate for the developed catchment.

Freeboard – adoption of 0.5 m clearance over and above the flow depth generated by the existing 100-year peak flow from the developed catchment. This freeboard allowance includes a maximum of 0.2 m to accommodate the impact of Climate Change.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully J. WYNDHAM PRINCE

DANIEL GARDINER Water Resources Engineer

Attachment F

Drainage Reserves / Easements Hydraulic Calculations