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#### Abstract

Over the recent years, the emphasis on sewerage has increasingly switched from provision of new services to maintenance of existing service at acceptable levels. As a consequence the need is now to rehabilitate existing systems rather than construct new ones.

The common methods of rehabilitation consist lining of the sewer pipes and that was out of the question since it decreases the diameters of the already under size sewer lines.

So that, hence, it was concluded that the best method for rehabilitating the existing system was by total replacement of the undersize sewer lines. This should be done using sewer pipes with better quality material, such as PVC, GRP or first class concrete pipes.

Modern water and wastewater pipe is either organic or inorganic in composition. Today's organic pipe is made of petroleum-derived plastic, which contains preservatives, antioxidants, and stabilizers to slow down the gradual loss in strength that occurs with organic materials ${ }^{[1]}$.

So that redesigned the existing sewer system in AL-Karadda district within the city of Baghdad by computer with the use of QBasic language. The design consist concrete pipes in once and plastic pipes in other to find the best.

Based on the results, it was concluded that the plastic pipes needed gradient ( $\mathrm{S}_{\text {min }}$ ) less than concrete pipes $(0.004 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}$ for plastic, $0.005 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}$ for concrete), the max. soil cover for plastic pipes was equal to ( 3.59 m ) while for concrete pipes it was equal to $(4.25 \mathrm{~m})$.In addition the network redesigned on the min . commercial concrete pipe diameter equal to $(200 \mathrm{~mm})$ while for plastic pipes equal to $(250 \mathrm{~mm})$ and that will increasing the capacity of the network.
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## دراسة مقارنة بين استخدام الآابيب البلاستيكية والآبابيب الكونكريتية لاعادة تصميم و انشاء شبكة مياه الصرف الصحي لمدينة بالة بـذاد (حي الكرادة - محلات 903-905 )



## Introduction

Various studies have been carried out to assess the respective performances of various pipe systems. A recent study - The Sustainable Municipal Pipe Systems project - carried out by Stein \& Partner in 2005, set out to examine the environmental impact of leakage and defects in non-pressure sewer systems and to compare the performance of flexible versus rigid pipe materials. Examples of flexible pipes are PVC, PE and PP. Examples
of rigid pipes are concrete and clay. The study found the overall defect rates of flexible pipe systems to be on average, one fifth of the rates of rigid pipe systems. Furthermore, the study found that the environmental impact caused by infiltration or exfiltration for flexible pipes was $15 \%$ of that for rigid pipe systems.

Flexible pipe systems excelled, primarily because of their flexibility enabling them to accommodate to shifts in the ground which may cause cracking or even collapse for rigid
pipe systems. The study looked at sewer pipe lines in Germany, Sweden and The Netherlands ${ }^{[2]}$.

After investigation and gathering relevant to be information about the sewer system of sections 903 and 905 of AL-Karadda in Baghdad which were used in this study as a result of their deteriorated conditions. It was found:
1- The sanitary network constructed according to the population, economical and commercial circumstances at that time.
2- All the network pipes were constructed with 225 mm in diameter.
3- During the survey, it was found that most pipes are corroded and it is believed that this is the cause of failure of some pipes in the network.
4- It was revealed that floodings take place during July and August of each year due to the increase of the water use due to air coolers.

Due to the huge design work which was needed to execute the sewer design for both sections, only part of section 903 was used in the subsequent analysis. The result of this analysis is considered to be applicable to the other areas of sections 903 and 905. The part of the sewer system which was chosen consisted of (71) pipes, (70) manholes and one pumping station (14A) Fig.(1).

## The Constraint and Assumption in the Design

The following were assumed:
1- Flow is induced by gravitational forces only, no vacuum pressure pipes will be considered in the design.

2- Steady state uniform flow (i.e., design is according to steady and uniform flow design equations).
3- Flow is subcritical to avoid the formation of hydraulic jumps that result in energy dissipation. The subcritical flow conditions are maintained by keeping Froude's number less than one.
4- Minimum allowable diameter which have been used was $(0.2 \mathrm{~m})$ for concrete pipes and $(0.25 \mathrm{~m})$ for plastic pipes.
5- Allowable velocity range: the maximum and minimum limits of velocities were taken equal to $(3.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$ and $(0.6 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$, respectively.
6- Minimum pipe cover: a min. cover of pipe, usually ( 1 m ), is required for protection against freezing, thawing and excessive loading.
7- Diameter progression: the diameter of any pipe must be equal to or greater than the targets diameter of the pipe just upstream of it and flowing into it. The gradation in the diameter was $0.025 \mathrm{~m}(0.2 \mathrm{~m}$, $0.225 \mathrm{~m}, \quad 0.25 \mathrm{~m}, \ldots .$. etc) for concrete pipes and for plastic pipes, the gradation in the diameter were $(0.25 \mathrm{~m}, 0.315 \mathrm{~m}$, $0.4 \mathrm{~m})^{[3]}$.
8- Invert progression: the upstream invert elevation of any pipe must be equal to or greater than downstream invert elevation of any pipe flowing into the same manhole.
9- Minor losses due to pipes entry into and exist from manholes, plus friction losses in manholes are considered so little as be negligible for straight flow through.
10- The network is tree shaped, i.e., it contains no losses, with its final
collection point being specified in advance by the designers.
11- For every pipe in the network the direction of flow is fixed in advance and flows are predetermined.
12- The Manning's coefficient is taken to be constant so as to get cleaning velocity higher than $(0.6 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$ and as a result less excavation depth can be obtained.
13- Pipes are partially filled with flow to a depth not exceeding ( $0.85 *$ diameter).
14- If a sewer changes direction in a manhole without changing its size, a drop of $(30 \mathrm{~mm})$ is to be provided in the manhole.
15- If the sewer changes size, the crowns of the inlet and outlet sewers at manholes are to be the same elevation to prevent back flow.
16- If a sewer changes both direction and size the largest drop from assumptions (14) and (15) above is considered.
17- A large drop manhole will be only if the height between the invert lower elevation of the entering pipe to the manhole and the invert upper elevation of the leaving pipe from the same manhole is the more than $(0.6 \mathrm{~m})$.
Ramp manhole will be used only, if this height is less than ( 0.6 m ) and more than $(0.25 \mathrm{~m})$.
18- The minimum slop $\left(\mathrm{S}_{\text {min }}\right)$ for any pipe was calculated from the following equation ${ }^{[4]}$ :
$S_{\text {min }}=1 / D \min$ (where, $D_{\text {min }}$ is in millimeters, can be assumed in the first iteration ).

## Principles of the Hydraulic Design

This design depends on steady and uniform flow to calculate the slope and diameters.

The following equations may be used:
Pon $=$ Mpd * At ---------------- (1)
$\mathrm{Ma}^{[5]}=1+14 / 4+\sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}$
Qs $=\operatorname{Arsf} * \operatorname{Mpd} * \operatorname{At} /(60 * 24)--$
(3)
$\mathrm{Qmax}=\mathrm{Qs} * \mathrm{Ma}$
Qinf $=$ Mri * At *60
Qp = Qinf + Qmax --------------- (6)
$\mathrm{Qf}=1 / \mathrm{n} * \mathrm{R}^{2 / 3} * \mathrm{~S}^{1 / 2} * \mathrm{~A} * 60----(7)$
Vf $=$ Qf / A * 60 -------------- (8)
Smax $=V^{2} \max * n^{2} *(4 / D)^{4 / 3}----(9)$
Hm = GU- INU ------------ (10)

Where:
Pon : No. of the population in (person).
$\mathrm{Mpd}^{[6]}$ : Max. population density in the served area ( 0.018 person / $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ).
At: Commutative served area in $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$.
Ma : The ratio of the max. sewage flow to the average flow.
P : The population in thousand $=($ Pon /1000).
Qs : Average sewage flow in ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}$ ).
Arsf ${ }^{[6]}$ : Average rate of sewage flow per capita (taken $1 \mathrm{~m}^{3} /$ capita).
Qmax ${ }^{[6]}$ : Max. sewage flow in ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}$ ).
Qinf $^{[6]}$ : Inf. flow in ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}$ ).
Mri : Inf. rate (taken $0.1 * 10^{-7}$ $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{m}^{2} / \mathrm{s}$ ).
Qp : Partial discharge or total discharge in the pipe in $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}\right)$.
Qf : Discharge for full flow in ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}$ ).
R : Hydraulic mean depth in (m) and it is assumed in full discharge ( $\mathrm{D} / 4$ ).
A : Cross section area of pipe $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$.
n : Manning's coefficient (taken 0.013
for concrete pipe and 0.01 for plastic pipe
Vf : Full velocity in (m/s).
Smax : Slope of the link $(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{m})$.
D : Commercial diameter of the pipe (m).

Hm : Depth of the manhole in (m).

Gu : Ground upper elevation at the manhole (m).
INU : Invert upper elevation of the manhole (m).

## Partial Velocity (Vp)

To calculate partial velocity the variation of hydraulic section of this state in the pipes must be know as illustrated in Fig.(2).
Fig.(3), which was given by Steel and McGhee ${ }^{[6]}$, this is a graph of the variation in ratio of part-full flow to full flow (Qp/Qf) and velocity partfull to velocity full ( $\mathrm{Vp} / \mathrm{Vf}$ ) with variation of depth of flow pipe diameter (d/D).

For the purpose of the dealing with the curve in computers, it is expressed by polynomial equation. This is equation was determined by regression analysis.

The equation was found to be ${ }^{[7]}$ $\mathrm{Y}=\left(65.312 * \mathrm{x}^{7}\right)-\left(241.603 * \mathrm{x}^{6}\right)+$ $\left(354.973 * x^{5}\right)-\left(264.397 * x^{4}\right)+$ $\left(106.754 * \mathrm{x}^{3}\right)-\left(23.877 * \mathrm{x}^{2}\right)+$ (3.646 * x) -0.0007

Where
X : Ratio of part-full flow to full flow ( $\mathrm{RQ}=\mathrm{Qp} / \mathrm{Qf}$ ).
Y : Ratio of depth of flow to pipe diameter (d/D).
Central angle is given by :
$\theta=2 \cdot \cos ^{-1}(1-2 . y)$
The ratio of the partial velocity to the full velocity $(\mathrm{Vr}=\mathrm{Vp} / \mathrm{Vf})$ is given by :
$\mathrm{Vr}=[(\theta-\sin \theta) / \theta]^{2 / 3}$.
$\mathrm{Vp}=\mathrm{Vr} . \mathrm{Vf}$

## Discussion of Results

In order to find whether it is better to use plastic pipes instead of the concrete pipes in rehabilitation of sanitary sewer network pipes, it is necessary to redesign the network.

As a result of this design, table (1), for concrete pipes, it was found that most lateral pipes which consisted of (56) pipes were designed with pipes of $(200 \mathrm{~mm})$ in diameters and (15) pipeline with larger than this. Hence, the main pipes were increased in diameter from ( 200 mm ) for starting pipe to $(500 \mathrm{~mm})$ for the last pipe which discharge to the pumping station (14A), Fig.(4).

While for plastic pipes in table (2), it was found that (59) pipelines were designed with ( 250 mm ) diameter and (12) pipelines with larger diameter. To assert these results, Fig. (5) was drawn which clearly shows that the increase in diameter begin from pipeline No. 7 which needed $(315 \mathrm{~mm})$ in diameter, other pipelines downstream also needed larger diameter than the existing.

Since the plastic pipes needed gradient less than that for concrete pipes $(0.004 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}$ for plastic and $0.005 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{m}$ for concrete), the Max. soil cover for plastic pipes was equal to ( 3.59 m ) while for the concrete pipes it was equal to $(4.25 \mathrm{~m})$ that means the plastic pipes need excavation less than concrete pipes.

In addition, the plastic pipes increased the network capacity by large diameter for pipes.
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Figure (1) Case study (Karadda city)


Figure (2) Percentage of sanitary sewers lengths vs. area


Figure (3) Hydraulic properties of circular sewers
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