## Appendix 14

Project : PERMOHONAN KEBENARAN MERANCANG BAGI CADANGAN MENDIRIKAN SEBUAH KILANG KERTAS (FASA 1) DAN KOMPONEN SOKONGAN DI ATAS SEBAHAGIAN PT 441, MUKIM PADANG MEHA, DAERAH KULIM, KEDAH DARUL AMAN.

Client : XSD INTERNATIONAL PAPER SDN BHD
Ref. No. 0919/HC/01/WC
Date 14/03/2019
Subject Hydraulic Calculations [Urban Stormwater Management Manual for Malaysia 2]

## Introduction

The proposed location is located at sebahagian pt 441, mukim Padang Meha, Daerah Kulim.
The purpose of this calculation is served to check the discharge $(\mathrm{Q})$ of this development and confirm the excess discharge of this development will not affect and upset the surrounding drainage system.

This design calculation is based on latest version of MSMA $2^{\text {nd }}$ edition ( Updated 23 MAY 2013)

## DESIGN DATA

## STATE

STATION NAME

## LAND USE

## CATCHMENT AREA

UPPER CATCHMENT AREA

TOTAL CATCHMENT AREA
$=$ KEDAH DARUL AMAN
= IBU BEKALAN SG. KULIM
$=$ FLAT
$=404686 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
$=\quad 0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
$=404686.00$
Or 40.4686 Hectares(Ha)

## CONTRIBUTION DEVELOPMENT AREA

| Sub-catchment Area | $=78524 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Or |  | 7.85 Hectares(Ha) |  |
| Impervious Area (Covered Up) |  | = | $70672 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 90\% |
|  | Or |  | 7.07 Hectares(Ha) |  |
| Pervious Area (Open Space) |  |  | $7852 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 10\% |
|  | Or |  | 0.79 Hectares(Ha) |  |

## DETERMINE TIME OF CONCENTRATION

Time of Concentration For Post-Development Where,

Overland Sheet Flow Travel Time

Overland Sheet Flow Path Length

Hortons roughness Value for
The Surface
Slope of Overland Surface
Therefore, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{o}}$
$\mathrm{N}=\quad 0.02 \mathrm{PAVED}$
Table 2.2
$\mathrm{S}=0.005 \%$
$=14.87$ Min

Where,

Travel Time in the Drain

Manning's Roughness Coefficient
Length of Drain

Hydraulic Radius

Friction Slope

Therefore, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$

Therefore, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}$,
Critical Time of Concentration for
Post development
$T_{d}=N L / 60 R^{2 / 3} S^{1 / 2}$
$\mathrm{N}=\quad 0.015$ CONCRETE
Table 2.3
$\mathrm{L}=957.00 \mathrm{M}$
$\mathrm{R}=0.471$
$\mathrm{S}=0.0010$
$=12.49 \mathrm{Min}$
$\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}=27.36$

## Determine $Q_{\text {(aPost) }}$ for the Post-Development Condition

Empirical equation can be used to minimise error in estimating the rainfall intensity values from the IDF curves.
The following equation adopted from Hydrological Procedure (HP) No. 1 revised based on MSMA 2

$$
\mathrm{I}=\Lambda \mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{k}} /((\mathrm{d} / 60)+\Theta)^{\mathrm{r}}
$$

Where $\quad I=$ Average Rainfall Intensity $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr})$
$\mathrm{T}=$ Average recurrence interval $-\mathrm{ARI}(0.5<\mathrm{T}<12$ month and $2<\mathrm{T}<100$ year $)$
$\mathrm{D}=$ Storm duration (hours), $0.0833<\mathrm{d}<72$
Variables $=$ Fitting constant dependent on the raingauge location (Table 2.B1 Appendix 2B)

## Using the Rational Method

| Development Data |  | Post Development |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Storm ARI for Post-Development, T | Year | 2 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| Time of Concentration, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Min | 27.36 | 27.36 | 27.36 | 27.36 | 27.36 |
| IDF Constant | $\lambda$ | 57.832 | 57.832 | 57.832 | 57.832 | 57.832 |
|  | K | 0.188 | 0.188 | 0.188 | 0.188 | 0.188 |
|  | $\ominus$ | 0.245 | 0.245 | 0.245 | 0.245 | 0.245 |
|  | $\pi$ | 0.751 | 0.751 | 0.751 | 0.751 | 0.751 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rainfall Intensity, I | $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 86.02 | 102.19 | 116.42 | 157.55 | 179.48 |
| Runoff Coefficient,C |  | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Catchment Area, A | Hectares | 7.85 | 7.85 | 7.85 | $\mathbf{7 . 8 5}$ | 7.85 |
| Design ARI Peak Flow, $\mathrm{Q}_{\text {(a Post) }}$ | $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 0 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 8 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 6 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 1 9 1}$ |

Therefore,
The Peak Flow for 2 Year ARI
The Peak Flow for 5 Year ARI
The Peak Flow for 10 Year ARI
The Peak Flow for 50 Year ARI
The Peak Flow for 100 Year ARI

| $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8 8 7} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 0 6 2} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{10}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 8 5 4} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{50}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 6 4 7} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| $\mathrm{Q}_{100}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 1 9 1} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ |


| DRAIN SIZE Computation : Manning Formula |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of drain is Concrete Drain |  |  |
| Proposed Drainage Width,m | = | 1.8 M |
| Proposed Average Drainage Height,m | $=$ | 1.80 M |
| Area of Drainage A, | A = | $2.545 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Wetted Perimeter of Drainage, P | $\mathrm{P}=$ | 5.4 M |
| Hydraulic Radius, $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}=$ | 0.471 |
| Friction Slope, S | S = | 0.001 |
| Mannig Coeeficient, n | $N=$ | 0.013 |
| Flow, $\mathrm{Q}_{\text {all }}$ | $\mathrm{Q}_{\text {all }}=$ | 3.7493 |


| The Peak Flow for 2 Year ARI | $\mathrm{Q}_{2}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8 9}<$ Qall | ok! |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The Peak Flow for 5 Year ARI | $\mathrm{Q}_{5}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 0 6}<$ Qall | ok! |
| The Peak Flow for 10 Year ARI | $\mathrm{Q}_{10}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 8 5}<$ Qall | ok! |
| The Peak Flow for 50 Year ARI | $\mathrm{Q}_{50}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 6 5}<$ Qall | ok! |
| The Peak Flow for 100 Year ARI | $\mathrm{Q}_{100}$ | $=$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 1 9}<$ Qall | ok! |

Qall is greater than Q2, Q10 \& Q100, therefore design drainage is OK

| Reference | Calculation |  | Output |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Units | Units |
| Figure 5.A1 <br> (MSMA2) | Region | 3 - NORTHERN |  |
|  | Project Area | 40.47 ha |  |
|  | Terrain | Mild |  |
|  | Catchment Area | 40.47 ha |  |
|  | Impervious Area | $=\quad \begin{array}{r} 303515 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ (30.3515 \mathrm{ha}) \end{array}$ |  |
|  | Pervious Area | $=\quad \begin{array}{r} 101171 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ (10.1171 \mathrm{ha}) \end{array}$ |  |
|  | \% of Impervious Area | $=\quad 75 \%$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Table 5.A1 } \\ & \text { (MSMA2) } \end{aligned}$ | Permissible Site Discharge (PSD)/ha: <br> For area of 40.4686ha, PSD $=40.4686 \times 69.9$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 69.9 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{ha} \\ 2828.76 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s} \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Table 5.A1 <br> (MSMA2) | Site Storage Requirement (SSR)/ha: |  | $\begin{aligned} & 454 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha} \\ & 18372.74 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | For area of 40.4686ha, SSR = | $40.4686 \times 454$ |  |
|  | The required storage is 18372 | 4m3 |  |

## Determine Storage Dimension

Propose volume of OSD
I) OSD
a) Detention pond

| width | $=$ | 102 m |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| length | $=$ | 195 m |
| Height | $=$ | 1.2 m |
| ge | $=$ | $23868.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |

Therefore,
Total capacity of storage

$$
\begin{array}{lrl}
= & 23868 \mathrm{~m}^{3} & \\
\geq & 18372.74 \mathrm{~m}^{3} & \text { O.K. }
\end{array}
$$

## Sizes of Outlet Orifice

| Project Area : | $=$ | 40.47 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Impervious Area : | $=$ | $75.0 \%$ |
| (Covered Up) |  |  |
| From Table 5.A.3 (MSMA 2) <br> Orifice Size of | $=$ | 600 Mm |
| outlet flow |  |  |



## Conclusion

The On-site detention pond and drainage system to control the discharge.
The discharge generated by this development onto the existing drainage system will be retained at the proposed drain and flow through the outlet opening.
Therefore, the excess discharge created by this development will not affect and upset the surrounding drainage system.

