Assessment of existing urban drainage system under contemporary rainfall in Tangerang, Indonesia
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Abstract. Flood has been dealing a devastating damage to human civilization yet it even could be exacerbated by climate change which increases the amount of precipitation. The investigation on an area within Tangerang Regency reveals the recent rainfall data set has higher mean and maximum value than the older one. The newly estimated design rainfall is 1.43 times the old design rainfall. Hence the expansion of the drainage channels is required for the existing system can no longer drain the escalated rainfall. Several studies also support the revision of existing drainage systems in order to adapt the new hydrological regime due to climate changes.

1. Introduction
Flood is a perpetual and universal disaster which is yet to be contained. Policy makers, engineers, academicians, and other stakeholders have been putting great effort to handle this issue for flood is capable to inflict heavy damage. Some examples of financial damage caused by flood were:

- Lestari has reported the devastating loss of IDR 6.7 trillion for the flood in Jakarta in 2012 [1];
- Kompas newsportal estimated the loss of IDR 1 trillion for the most recent Jakarta flood in January 2020 [2];
- Another study estimated Jakarta suffered about USD 321 million (about IDR 4.7 trillion using USD 1 = IDR 14,654 conversion rate in May 2020) annually because of flooding [3];
- Wu appraised the economic loss of RMB 6.98 million (IDR 14.33 trillion using 1 RMB = 2053 IDR) for the flood in Lizhong Town in 2006 and RMB 2.2 million (IDR 4.52 trillion) for the flood in Houbai Town in 2015 [4]; and
- Huang reported the economic damage of USD 8.93 million (IDR 130 trillion) due to the flood in Hunan Province in 2008 [5].

Flood keeps recurring although most settlements already have drainage systems designed. Inadequate and erroneous existing design is one of major reason, but recent researches reveal the significance of climate change and urbanization (which results in land use change) [6] [7] as the major contributors. It is important to accurately identify the problem so stakeholders can precisely formulate solutions in order to prevent flood in future.

This study aims to assess if the existing drainage system in a local area is still sufficient to anticipate flood. The objective is achieved by comparing the rainfall data set used to design the existing drainage system with the more recent rainfall data set. Afterwards, both design rainfall and channels dimension are calculated and compared.
2. Case study
The location of the case study is at Pasar Kemis, West Tangerang, Indonesia. The coordinate of the area is 106°31’17.28”E and 6°12’24.26”S and the study focuses around the main street i.e. Otonom Pasar Kemis Street. The street is a very vital for it provides access for people and cargo to move from and to Pasar Kemis subdistrict where more than 200,000 people live [8]. Unfortunately, flood regularly strikes the area hence damaging many residential houses and infrastructures and putting the economic activities to halt.

Figure 1, Figure 2, and Table 1 display the characteristics of the drainage system in the assessed area. Figure 1 depicts the map of the drainage network and it shows the drainage channels are positioned at both sides of streets and the general flow direction is northward. Figure 2 depicts the catchment area for each channel. The number labels in the figure are for Table 1 where the table presents the design discharge as well as their dimensions.

Figure 1. The plan view of the drainage network of Otonom Pasar Kemis Street (with slight modification from original figure) [9]
Figure 2. The sketch of catchment area of each drainage channel (based on Figure 1)

Table 1. The design discharge and the dimension of the channels [9]

| Num | Channel (location)            | $Q_{design}$ (10^{-3} m^3/s) | $b_{design}$ (m) | $h_{design}$ (m) |
|-----|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1   | P1-P2 (Jl. Raya Serang)       | 89.7                          | 1.0              | 0.5              |
| 2   | P2-P5 (Jl. Otonom Pasar Kemis)| 179.2                         | 1.0              | 1.0              |
| 3   | P3-P4 (Jl. Raya Serang)       | 89.5                          | 1.0              | 0.5              |
| 4   | P5-P6 (Jl. Cikupa)            | 455.2                         | 0.5              | 0.5              |
| 5   | P10-P11 (Jl. Otonom Pasar Kemis)| 40.6                           | 0.5          | 0.5              |
| 6   | P11-P12 (Jl. Raya Pasar Kemis)| 32.2                          | 0.5              | 0.5              |

Table 2. The comparison of rainfall used for the existing design and for the design review

| Year | Rainfall for the existing design (mm) | Rainfall for the design review (mm) |
|------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1982 | 98.88                                 |                                     |
| 1983 | 65.49                                 |                                     |
| 1984 | 76.86                                 |                                     |
| 1985 | 57.12                                 |                                     |
| 1986 | 75.93                                 |                                     |
| 1987 | 92.61                                 |                                     |
| 1988 | 65.83                                 |                                     |
| 1989 | 71.44                                 |                                     |
| 1990 | 68.61                                 |                                     |
| 1991 | 53.90                                 |                                     |
| 1992 | 93.23                                 |                                     |
| 1993 | 94.78                                 |                                     |
| 1994 | 64.01                                 |                                     |
| 1995 | 115.68                                |                                     |
| 1996 | 131.50                                |                                     |
| 1997 | 58.50                                 |                                     |
| 1998 | 72.50                                 |                                     |
| 1999 | 93.75                                 |                                     |
| 2000 | 112.75                                |                                     |
| 2001 | 73.50                                 |                                     |
The precipitation (rainfall) for the existing design were derived from the regional averaged value of rainfall station of Cinangka, Kalen Petung, Petir, and Cadas Sari which were averaged arithmetically. Unfortunately, the whereabouts and other information about the stations are no longer available. The rainfall data used for the design review is derived from Budiarto Curug meteorology station which is positioned at 106°33’50” E and 6°17’12”S at +46 m MSL. The station is located at the southeast of Pasar Kemis. Both data for the existing design and for the design review are presented on Table 2.

### Table 2. The comparison of statistical parameters between older and recent rainfall data

| Year      | Rainfall for the existing design (mm) | Rainfall for the design review (mm) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2002      | 57.50                                | 96.00                              |
| 2003      | 65.00                                |                                    |
| 2004      | 86.75                                | 87.70                              |
| 2005      | 89.25                                | 87.10                              |
| 2006      | 63.00                                | 68.10                              |
| 2007      | 79.00                                | 227.50                             |
| 2008      | 76.25                                | 82.00                              |
| 2009      | 82.00                                | 106.00                             |
| 2010      | 100.27                               | 84.30                              |
| 2011      | 80.96                                | 83.40                              |
| 2012      | 120.00                               |                                    |
| 2013      | 103.40                               |                                    |
| 2014      | 112.50                               |                                    |
| 2015      | 152.50                               |                                    |
| 2016      | 103.50                               |                                    |
| 2017      | 162.60                               |                                    |
| 2018      | 78.00                                |                                    |

3. Result and analysis

Firstly, the statistical parameters of rainfall for the existing design and the design review are analyzed. The recent rainfall (2004-2018) are higher in maximum, average, and standard deviation (see Table 3). Consequently, the newer design rainfall will be higher than the previous one. Their probability of occurrences are also analyzed by plotting of non-exceedance probability for both rainfall data (P = i / (n +1); P = non-exceedance probability, i = series, n = population size). Figure 3 shows the plotting and it clearly points out the trend shift towards heavier rain in the current condition rather than the past.

This finding is consistent with other studies which found the similarly increasing trend of maximum or extreme precipitation such as in Poland [10] or in Denmark [11]. However, this finding must be interpreted with caveat that the trend could differ from one place to others [12] hence further researches must be conducted to determine if the trend of escalating precipitation applies to its surrounding areas. Furthermore, it is very difficult to tell if the trend comes from nature, humans, or sampling variability [13].
The approach to obtain the channels’ dimension for both design are referred to Indonesia national standard [14]. Firstly, the design rainfall is calculated by frequency analysis. By the regulation of the Public Work Ministry [15], the return period used is 5 years by taking into account the population of the city. The result is presented at the bottom line of Table 3 which outlines the growth of the design rainfall by 43 % (from 94.20 mm to 134.38 mm).

The consequence of escalating rainfall is the necessity of larger drainage channels’ capacity. Manning formula is employed to calculate the required channel’s dimension in order to sufficiently drain the incoming flood. The design parameters for the design review are similar to the existing design except for the rainfall data. The results are presented on Table 4 which indicates the increasing design discharge for the drainage network. It directly translates into the need to increase the dimension of the channels so that they can prevent incoming flood.

Table 4. The difference in the channels’ specification between using the older rainfall data and the more recent data

| Num | Channel | $Q_{\text{design}}$ $(10^3 \text{m}^3/\text{s})$ | $b_{\text{design}}$ (m) | $h_{\text{design}}$ (m) | $Q_{\text{review}}$ $(10^3 \text{m}^3/\text{s})$ | $b_{\text{review}}$ (m) | $h_{\text{review}}$ (m) |
|-----|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1   | P1-P2   | 89.7                        | 1.0                 | 0.5              | 128.0                      | 1.0                 | 0.6              |
| 2   | P2-P5   | 276.0                       | 1.0                 | 1.0              | 393.7                      | 1.0                 | 1.3              |
| 3   | P3-P4   | 89.5                        | 1.0                 | 0.5              | 127.7                      | 1.0                 | 0.6              |
| 4   | P5-P6   | 43.4                        | 0.5                 | 0.5              | 61.9                       | 0.5                 | 0.6              |
| 5   | P10-P11 | 40.6                        | 0.5                 | 0.5              | 57.9                       | 0.5                 | 0.6              |
| 6   | P11-P12 | 32.2                        | 0.5                 | 0.5              | 45.9                       | 0.5                 | 0.6              |

4. Conclusion

The existing drainage system in Pasar Kemis (Tangerang) is no longer sufficient to drain the incoming flood under the new hydrological regime. It increases the maximum or extreme rainfall which results in the need to expand the existing drainage channels’ dimension. Furthermore, the effect of urbanization has not been taken into account thus the required expansion could be possibly even larger.

It is still technically difficult for certain to attribute the trend of the escalating maximum rainfall to climate changes and more researches are required to confirm this. Many studies around the world have
already been performed which indicate the need to increase the capacity of the current urban drainage system due to climate changes [16] [17] [18]. However, there are still so many uncertainties about the relation between climate changes and precipitation characteristics. Climate changes could increase extreme or mean precipitation such as in this paper, but it also could change its duration and temporal distribution throughout a year and it could change other things yet to be hitherto revealed. Although the relation between them is still vague at best, incorporating the effect of climate change in designing drainage system is very important to protect people from flood.
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