



DETERMINATION OF UNTRADITIONAL SEWERAGE SYSTEMS DESIGN CRITERIA ACCORDING TO EGYPTIAN CONDITIONS

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering
Ain Shams University for the Fulfillment
of the Requirement of Ph. Degree
in Civil Engineering

Prepared by

ENG. HOSSAM MOSTAFA HUSSEIN AHMED

M.Sc. of Civil Engineering, August 2007
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. MOHAMED EL HOSSIENY EL NADI

Professor of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, EGYPT

Prof. Dr. MAHMOUD MOHAMED ABDEL AZEEM

Professor of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, EGYPT

2013



DETERMINATION OF UNTRADITIONAL SEWERAGE SYSTEMS DESIGN CRITERIA ACCORDING TO EGYPTIAN CONDITIONS

A Thesis For
**The Ph. Degree in Civil Engineering
(SANITARY ENGINEERING)**

by
ENG. HOSSAM MOSTAFA HUSSEIN AHMED

M.Sc. of Civil Engineering, August 2007
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

THESIS APPROVAL

EXAMINERS COMMITTEE

SIGNATURE

Prof. Dr. Mostafa Mohamed Abdel- Warith -----
Professor of Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ryerson University, Toronto Canada

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Shaaban Negm -----
Professor of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny El Nadi -----
Professor of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Abdel Azeem -----
Professor of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Date:- ---/--/2013

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this work to who suffered to educate,
prepare, build capacity and help myself to be as I am,

TO MY MOTHER AND MY FATHER

Also thanks

TO MY WIFE

for her encouragement and support to complete this work

STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University, Faculty of Engineering for the degree of Ph.D in Civil Engineering.

The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author in the department of Public Works, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, from January 2008 to January 2013.

No part of the thesis has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other University or Institution.

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others

Date: - ---/-- /2013

Signature: - -----

Name: - **HOSSAM MOSTAFA HUSSIEN AHMED**

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*The candidate is deeply grateful to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny Abdel Rhman EL Nadi**, Professor of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for suggesting the problem, help, encourage, co-operation sponsoring and patient advising during preparation of this research.*

*And deep thanks to **Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Abdel Azeem**, Professor of sanitary and Environmental Engineering, Ain Shams University, for his help, and co-operation during the preparation of this research.*

ABSTRACT

NAME :- HOSSAM MOSTAFA HUSSIEN AHMED

Title :- “DETERMINATION OF UNTRADITIONAL SEWERAGE SYSTEMS DESIGN CRITERIA ACCORDING TO EGYPTIAN CONDITIONS”.

Faculty : Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Specialty : Civil Eng., Public Works, Sanitary Engineering

Summary :

This study aims to produce local wastewater flow factors (peaking and minimum) for sewerage systems of Egyptian rural areas according to the population & average wastewater flow rate. In order to produce local factors; data of wastewater flow rate through one year for 12 villages in 3 governorates (Kfr El Sheikh, El Menia, and Qena) were measured and recorded. Then two groups of models were produced as follow:

Group (A) consists of four flow factors models according to population.

Group (B) consists of four flow factors models according to average wastewater flow rates. Four models for each group are: Hourly Peaking Flow Factor (HPF), Hourly Minimum Flow Factors (HMF), Daily Peaking Flow Factors (DPF), and Daily Minimum Flow Factor (DMF).

The produced wastewater flow factors were evaluated and compared with Egyptian code models and widely used wastewater flow factors models.

Wastewater flow factors obtained from study produced models give nearest values to the field results with percentages of errors between ± 1 to 20 %, and ± 1 to 25% for groups (A) and (B) respectively, in the other hand, the wastewater flow factors obtained from Egyptian code models and widely used wastewater flow factors models give percentages of errors more than 101%, and 150% for groups (A) and (B) respectively. Also, the comparison between HPF obtained from Egyptian Code models, and HPF obtained from study produced model indicates that the produced HPF can be obtained by multiplying E.C HPF models in a reduction factor of 0.76.

So, this study recommends using the produced wastewater flow factors models in the design of sewerage systems in Egyptian rural areas which will reduce size of sewerage system elements such as pipes and pumps and achieve bigger operation and maintenance efficiency and saving costs, especially with the lacking of wastewater facilities and investments in these areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
COVER	i
THESIS APPROVAL	ii
DEDICATION	iii
STATEMENT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
LIST OF UNITS	xvii
 <u>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</u>	
1.1. GENERAL	1
1.2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	1
1.3. OBJECTIVES OF CURRENT RESEARCH	1
1.4. SCOPE OF WORK	1
1.4.1 EXPERIMENTAL WORK	2
1.4.2 ANALYTICAL WORK	2
1.5. THESIS ORGANIZATION	2
 <u>CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW</u>	
2.1. INTRODUCTION	4
2.2. DEFINITIONS OF WASTE WATER FLOW RATES	4
2.3. UNTRADITIONAL SEWERAGE SYSTEMS	5
2.3.1 VACUUM SEWERAGE SYSTEM	5
2.3.2 PRESSURE SEWERAGE SYSTEM	5
2.3.3 SMALL-BORE SEWER SYSTEM	6
2.3.4 SHALLOW SEWERAGE SYSTEM	6
2.3.5 SIMPLIFIED SEWERAGE SYSTEM	7
2.4. APPLIED SEWERAGE SYSTEMS IN EGYPTIAN RURAL AREAS	8
2.5. COMMON FORMULAS USED IN ESTIMATING PEAKING AND MINIMUM FLOW FACTORS	9
2.6. PREVIOUS STUDIES	10
 <u>CHAPTER III: MATERIALS AND METHODS</u>	
3.1 GENERAL	19
3.2 STUDY PROGRAM	19
3.3 EXPERIMENTAL WORKS	19

3.3.1	CHOSE THE SUITABLE LOCATIONS	19
3.3.2	COLLECT REQUIRED DATA	20
3.3.3	FLOW MEASUREMENTS IN STUDIED LOCATIONS	20
3.3.3.1	LOCATIONS OF FLOW MEASUREMENTS	20
3.3.3.2	MANNER OF FLOW MEASUREMENTS	20
3.3.4	COLLECT DATA FROM HCWW MP	21
3.4	KFR EL SHEIKH GOVERNORATE	21
3.4.1	STUDIED LOCATIONS SELECTION	23
3.4.2	EL MOUFTY EL KOUBRA VILLAGE	23
3.4.2.1	LOCATION DESCRIPTION	23
3.4.2.2	LAND USES	24
3.4.2.3	BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT	25
3.4.2.4	CLIMATE	25
3.4.2.5	EXISTING SITUATION OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	26
3.4.2.6	SEWERAGE FACILITIES DESCRIPTION	26
3.4.3	OM EL SEN VILLAGE	31
3.4.3.1	LOCATION DESCRIPTION	31
3.4.3.2	EXISTING SITUATION OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	33
3.4.3.3	SEWERAGE FACILITIES DESCRIPTION	33
3.4.4	EL KOLEAAH VILLAGE	37
3.4.4.1	LOCATION DESCRIPTION	37
3.4.4.2	EXISTING SITUATION OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	38
3.4.4.3	SEWERAGE FACILITIES DESCRIPTION	39
3.5	EL MENIA GOVERNORATE.	43
3.5.1	VILLAGES OF EL MENIA GOVERNORATE	44
3.5.1.1	EL MANSOURA VILLAGE	44
3.5.1.2	NEW SOLTAN VILLAGE	44
3.5.1.3	EL MKLAB VILLAGE	44
3.5.1.4	ABOU KORKAS VILLAGE	45
3.6	QENA GOVERNORATE	45
3.6.1	VILLAGES OF QENA GOVERNORATE	46
3.6.1.1	EL OMAAL VILLAGE	46
3.6.1.2	EL MANSHIA VILLAGE	46
3.6.1.3	EL MAANA VILLAGE	47
3.6.1.4	EL NAHAL VILLAGE	47
3.6.1.5	HOD ASHRA VILLAGE	47
<u>CHAPTER IV: RESULTS</u>		
4.1	INTRODUCTION	48
4.2	FIELD RESULTS OF KFR EL SHIEKH VILLAGES	48
4.2.1	EL MOUFTY ELKOUBRA VILLAGE	48
4.2.2	OM EL SEN VILLAGE	51
4.2.3	EL KOLEAAH VILLAGE	53

4.3	COLLECTED DATA FOR EL MENIA VILLAGES	55
4.3.1	EL MANSOURA VILLAGE	55
4.3.2	NEW SOLTAN VILLAGE	55
4.3.3	EL MKLB VILLAGE	56
4.3.4	ABOU KORKAS VILLAGE	57
4.4	COLLECTED DATA FOR QENA VILLAGES	58
4.4.1	EL OMAAL VILLAGE	58
4.4.2	EL MANSHIA VILLAGE	59
4.4.3	EL MAANA VILLAGE	60
4.4.4	EL NAHAL VILLAGE	61
4.4.5	HOD ASHRA VILLAGE	62
4.5	SUMMARY OF DATA	64

CHAPTER V: MODELING

5.1	INTRODUCTION	65
5.2	CLASSIFICATION OF EGYPT RURAL AREAS ACCORDING TO POPULATION	65
5.3	CALSSIFICATION OF THE STUIDED VILLAGES	65
5.4	PRODUCTION OF MODELS ACCORDING TO POPULATION	66
5.4.1	PRODUCTION OF MODELS FOR CATEGORY (A)	66
5.4.2	PRODUCTION OF MODELS FOR CATEGORY (B)	70
5.4.3	PRODUCTION OF MODELS FOR CATEGORY (C)	73
5.5	PRODUCTION OF GENERAL MODELS	76
5.6	PRODUCTION OF MODELS ACCORDING TO AVERAGE WASTEWATER FLOW RATE	79

CHAPTER VI: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

6-1	INTRODUCTION	83
6-2	EVALUATION OF MODELS ACCORDING TO POPULATION	83
6-2-1	COMPARISON BETWEEN MODELS AND FIELD RESULTS	83
6-2-1-1	CATEGORY (A) MODELS	83
6-2-1-2	CATEGORY (B) MODELS	85
6-2-1-3	CATEGORY (C) MODELS	86
6-2-1-4	GENERAL MODELS	88
6-2-2	VERIFICATION OF PRODUCED MODELS	90
6-2-2-1	CATEGORY (A) MODELS	91
6-2-2-2	CATEGORY (B) MODELS	94
6-2-2-3	CATEGORY (C) MODELS	96
6-2-2-4	GENERAL MODELS	99
6-3	SUMMARY OF MODELS EVALUATION ACCORDING	

TO POPULATION	101
6-4 EVALUATION OF MODELS ACCORDING TO AVERAGE WASTEWATER FLOW RATE	101
6-4-1 COMPARISON BETWEEN MODELS AND FIELD RESULTS	102
6-4-1-1 HPF MODELS	102
6-4-1-2 DPF MODELS	103
6-4-2 VERIFICATION OF PRODUCED MODELS	104
6-5 SUMMARY OF MODELS EVALUATION ACCORDING TO AVERAGE WASTE WATER FLOW RATE	107
6-6 MODIFICATION OF EGYPTIAN CODE MODELS	107
 <u>CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION</u>	
7.1 CONCLUSIONS	108
7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	110
7.3 FURTHER RESEARCH	111
 REFERENCES	 113
ANNEX (A)	117

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 2-1. Costs of Conventional and Simplified (Condominial in-Block) Sewerage, and On-Site Sanitation in Natal in Northeast Brazil in 1983	8
Figure 2-2. DPF for Different Communities at Different Probabilities	11
Figure 2-3. Probability Distribution of using WC for Different User Types (L) during Weekdays	13
Figure 2-4. Probability Distribution of using Shower for Different User Types (L) at Weekend	13
Figure 2-5. The Base Community Composition of the Parametric Study	13
Figure 2-6. Contributions of the Various Community Members to The Final Weekday Hydrograph for a 1000 Capita LCC	14
Figure 2-7. The Contribution of Community Composition on The Hydrographs Generated at The Downstream of MCC for 1000 Capita at Weekend	14
Figure 2-8. Sewer and Pumped 1-HPF and 1- HPF Estimated using EC for LCC	15
Figure 2-9. Sewer and Pumped 1-HPF and 1- HPF Estimated using EC for HCC	15
Figure 2-10. PF for Sewers for Populations exceeding 50,000 capita	16
Figure 2-11. PF for Preliminary Treatment Works and Pumping Stations	17
Figure 3-1. Kfr El Sheikh Governorate	22
Figure 3-2. Location of El Moufty El Koubra Village	24
Figure 3-3. Location of Om El Sen Village	32
Figure 3-4. Location of El Koleaah Village	38
Figure 4-1. El Moufty El Koubra Field Results	49
Figure 4-2. Sewage Flow through Maximum Day for El Moufty El Koubra	50
Figure 4-3. Sewage Flow through Minimum Day for El Moufty El Koubra	50
Figure 4-4. Om El Sen Field Results	51
Figure 4-5. Sewage Flow through Maximum Day for Om El Sen	52
Figure 4-6. Sewage Flow through Minimum Day for Om El Sen	52
Figure 4-7. El Koleaah Field Results	53

Figure 4-8.	Sewage Flow through Maximum Day for El Koleaah	54
Figure 4-9.	Sewage Flow through Minimum Day for El Koleaah	54
Figure 4-10.	Collected Data for El Mansoura Village	55
Figure 4-11.	Collected Data for New Soltan Village	56
Figure 4-12.	Data Collected for El Mklb Village	57
Figure 4-13.	Collected Data for Abou Korkas Village	58
Figure 4-14.	Collected Data for El Omaal Village	59
Figure 4-15.	Collected Data for El Manshia Village	60
Figure 4-16.	Collected Data for El Maana Village	61
Figure 4-17.	Collected Data for El Nahal Village	62
Figure 4-18.	Collected Data for Hod Ashra Village	63
Figure 5-1.	HPF for CAT A Villages	68
Figure 5-2.	DPF for CAT A Villages	68
Figure 5-3.	HMF for CAT A Villages	69
Figure 5-4.	DMF for CAT A Villages	69
Figure 5-5.	HPF for CAT B Villages	71
Figure 5-6.	DPF for CAT B Villages	72
Figure 5-7.	HMF for CAT B Villages	72
Figure 5-8.	DMF for CAT B Villages	73
Figure 5-9.	HPF for CAT C Villages	74
Figure 5-10.	DPF for CAT C Villages	75
Figure 5-11.	HMF for CAT C Villages	75
Figure 5-12.	DMF for CAT C Villages	76
Figure 5-13.	General HPF	77
Figure 5-14.	General DPF	78
Figure 5-15.	General HMF	78
Figure 5-16.	General DMF	79
Figure 5-17.	HPF according to Average Flow Rate	80
Figure 5-18.	DPF according to Average Flow Rate	80
Figure 5-19.	HMF according to Average Flow Rate	81
Figure 5-20.	DMF according to Average Flow Rate	81
Figure 6-1.	Field and EC Models Results for HPF-CAT A	84
Figure 6-2.	Field and EC Models Results for HMF-CAT A	84
Figure 6-3.	Field and EC Models Results for HPF-CAT B	85
Figure 6-4.	Field and EC Models Results for HMF-CAT B	86
Figure 6-5.	Field and EC Models Results for HPF-CAT C	87
Figure 6-6.	Field and EC Models Results for HMF-CAT C	87
Figure 6-7.	Field and EC Models Results for HPF-General	88
Figure 6-8.	Field and EC Models Results for HMF-General	89
Figure 6-9.	Verification of Produced HPF Models Category A	92
Figure 6-10.	Verification of Produced DPF Models Category A	92

Figure 6-11.	Verification of Produced HMF Models Category A	93
Figure 6-12.	Verification of Produced DMF Models Category A	93
Figure 6-13.	Verification of Produced HPF Models Category B	94
Figure 6-14.	Verification of Produced DPF Models Category B	95
Figure 6-15.	Verification of Produced HMF Models Category B	95
Figure 6-16.	Verification of Produced DMF Models Category B	96
Figure 6-17.	Verification of Produced HPF Models Category C	97
Figure 6-18.	Verification of Produced DPF Models Category C	97
Figure 6-19.	Verification of Produced HMF Models Category C	98
Figure 6-20.	Verification of Produced DMF Models Category C	98
Figure 6-21.	Verification of General Produced HPF Models	99
Figure 6-22.	Verification of General Produced DPF Models	100
Figure 6-23.	Verification of General Produced HMF Models	100
Figure 6-24.	Verification of General Produced DMF Models	101
Figure 6-25.	Field Results and Munksgaard & Young HPF Models	102
Figure 6-26.	Field Results and Munksgaard & Young DPF Models	103
Figure 6-27.	Verification of Produced HPF Models According to Average Wastewater Flow Rates	105
Figure 6-28.	Verification of Produced DPF Models According to Average Wastewater Flow Rates	105
Figure 6-29.	Verification of Produced HMF Models According to Average Wastewater Flow Rates	106
Figure 6-30.	Verification of Produced DMF Models According to Average Wastewater Flow Rates	106
Figure 6-31.	Modification of EC HPF models	107
Figure 7-1.	A Comparison between Produced Models and EC Models according to Population	109
Figure 7-2.	A Comparison between Produced Models and Widely used Models according to AWWFR	110
Figure 7-3.	Modification of EC HPF Models	111

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 2-1. Widely used Peak and Minimum Flow Factors Formulae	9
Table 2-2. Peaking Factors at Year 2009 Lake Havasu City-Arizona	11
Table 2-3. PF for Sewers	16
Table 2-4. PF for Preliminary Treatment Works and Pumping Stations	16
Table 2-5. Peaking Factor according to Sewer Size	18
Table 2-6. Overall Peak Factor for various Agencies	18
Table 3-1. Water Treatment Plants in Kfr El Sheikh Governorate	23
Table 3-2. Summary of Climate in El Moufty El Koubra Village through The Year	26
Table 3-3. Different Types of Interceptor Tanks	27
Table 3-4. Served Population of El Moufty El Koubra Village until Saturation Year	29
Table 3-5. ASF of El Moufty El Koubra Village till Saturation Year	29
Table 3-6. Average Length and Purpose of Different Pipe in Om El Sen Sewer Network	34
Table 3-7. Percentage of Full and Slopes of Different Pipe Diameters in Om El Sen Sewer Network	35
Table 3-8. Served Population of Om El Sen Village until Saturation Year	37
Table 3-9. ASF of Om El Sen Village until Saturation Year	37
Table 3-10. Typical Dimensions of Inspection Chambers	40
Table 3-11. Typical Types of Manholes	40
Table 3-12. Average Length of Sewer Network	40
Table 3-13. Percentage of Full and Slopes of Different Pipe Diameters in El Koleaah Sewer Network	41
Table 3-14. Served Population of El Koleaah Village until Saturation Year	42
Table 3-15. ASF of El Koleaah Village until Saturation Year	43
Table 3-16. Population of El Menia Markazes	43
Table 3-17. Population of Villages of El Menia Governorate	44
Table 3-18. Population of Qena Markazes	45
Table 3-19. Population of Villages of Qena Governorate	46
Table 4-1. Data Summary of the Studied Villages	64
Table 5-1. Classification of Studied Villages	66
Table 5-2. Summary of Data for Category (A) Villages	66

Table 5-3.	Estimated FF for Category (A) Villages	67
Table 5-4.	Summary of Data for Category (B) Villages	70
Table 5-5.	Estimated FF for Category (B) Villages	70
Table 5-6.	Summary of Data for Category (C) Villages	73
Table 5-7.	Estimated FFM for Category (C) Villages	74
Table 5-8.	Data of Villages used to produce General Models	76
Table 6-1.	Field, Code and Produced Models Results for Hourly Flow Factors-(CAT A)	85
Table 6-2.	Field, Code and Produced Models Results for Hourly Flow Factors-(CAT B)	86
Table 6-3.	Field, Code and Produced Models Results for Hourly Flow Factors-(CAT C)	88
Table 6-4.	Field, Code and Produced Models Results for Hourly Flow Factors-General	89
Table 6-5.	Data of the Villages used in Models Verification	90
Table 6-6.	Flow Factors Values for Villages used in Models Verification	91
Table 6-7.	Field Results, Munksgaard & Young, and Produced Models for HPF	102
Table 6-8.	Field Results, Munksgaard & Young, and Produced Models for DPF	104