

Hello,

As a long term practitioner in the water and wastewater industry I would like to make a couple of comments regarding the SEPP review.

Firstly the containment standard identified in Clause 27. I believe that for consistency and clarity it is important for the SEPP to define exactly what a “1 in 5-year rainfall event” is. Historically the 1 in 5 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) event as defined in Australian Rainfall and Runoff (1987) was adopted. This in turn used information (intensities and temporal patterns) derived by the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM). The BOM have subsequently redefined the rainfall statistics and have moved away from a Recurrence Interval to an Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). This is a small but subtle change as a 1 in 5 ARI event corresponds to an 18.1% exceedance probability (<http://www.bom.gov.au/water/designRainfalls/ifd/glossary.shtml>). The review of the SEPP seems like a good time to confirm/clarify the language used to describe the magnitude of the rainfall event to be contained in consistent terms with the BOM. It will also be important to consider the combined probability of events. Some authorities are aligning peak wet weather flows with peak dry weather flows (which is potentially a higher containment standard than anticipated) while others are using average dry weather flow (which could be a lesser standard than desired).

Secondly a comment on the Policy Impact Assessment – Box 20. Smart Pressure Sewer systems can be developed without SCADA connectivity – you could call these “optimised pressure sewer systems” as the pumps can have inbuilt routines that create flushing waves etc. to reduce pipe size and sewage age without needing connectivity to other pump units. This is important to consider as the SCADA costs can be significant and should not lead to Pressure Sewer being discounted from the analysis.

If you would like further information on either of these points please don't hesitate to contact me,  
Regards

**Urban Water Solutions**