

EFFECT OF DESIGN PEAK FLOW FACTOR TO THE CAPITAL COST OF  
SEWERAGE RETICULATION IN MALAYSIA

LEE YUN FOOK

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Doctor of Engineering (Process Plant Management)

Faculty of Chemical and Energy Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

FEBRUARY 2016

**DEDICATION**

*I dedicate this humble effort to my parents,  
my beloved wife and our lovely son for their  
continuous prayers, love, support and understanding*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my supervisors, Prof. Dr Abdull Rahim Mohd Yusoff and Dato Seri Dr. Zaini Ujang for their advice and guidance throughout the course of study. My sincere appreciation also extends to my industrial supervisor, Ir Dr Lim Phaik Leng for his invaluable support and assistance.

This research was supported by the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) and I am very grateful for their financial contribution. I am also thankful to the staff members of the Institute of Bioproduct Development (IBD, UTM), my colleagues in Waste & Environment Team of Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn. Bhd.

In the process of preparing this dissertation, I was in contact with many people, including researchers, engineers, academicians, industry experts and consultants. They have contributed extensively towards my understanding and thoughts. My heartfelt appreciation also extends to all of them. Special thanks to Ms Lim Pek Boon and team of Indah Water Konsortium for their great help in providing data for my research.

I am deeply indebted to my parents. Without them, I would not be the person I am today. Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife, Tan Mei Jiun and baby, Lee Ming Xuan for their continuous love, support and encouragement.

## ABSTRACT

The design peak flow factor (DPFF) formula prescribed in MS1228:1991 is commonly adopted in sewerage industry in Malaysia although the validity of this formula has not been verified since its publication 24 years ago. Local research findings and feedback from industry revealed that the DPFF has been over provided for all sewerage services which lead to over design and increase in capital cost as well as operation and maintenance (O&M) cost. The Government has planned to raise the sewerage tariff to cover high O&M cost in sewage treatment plants. In view of RM10.3 billion of sewerage projects had been approved under the Tenth Malaysia Plan, the research on design and cost optimization in sewerage services is timely and in line with country needs. The aim of this research is to prove via statistical analysis that the DPFF is higher than both the actual peak flow factor (APFF) in sewerage services and international peak flow factor (IPFF); to recommend a more optimised peak flow factor (PFF) formula in lieu of the current DPFF; and to evaluate its financial effect to the sewerage reticulation projects in Malaysia. Hourly flow data was collected via online electromagnetic and ultrasonic flow meter connected to the Supervisory, Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system at five centralised sewage treatment plants (CSTP) with capacity ranging from 73,000 to 394,000 population equivalent (PE). The analysis revealed that the DPFF for all five CSTPs were overprovided by 23% to 63% as compared to the APFF. A comparison between Malaysian DPFF with six IPFF formulas, namely Babbitt, Duncan, Giffit, Harmon, Johnson and Utah showed that Malaysian DPFF is the highest among all IPFFs from 10,000 PE to 1 million PE. In addition, the APFF calculated for five CSTPs are close to Utah, Babbitt and Harmon PFF. Based on the highest APFF among five CSTPs, a more optimised PFF formula:  $3.8/P^{0.11}$  (named as Lee's PFF) is recommended in lieu of the original DPFF of  $4.7/P^{0.11}$ . Three IPFF i.e. Utah, Babbitt and Harmon, together with Lee's PFF were selected for financial analysis which involve proper engineering design using Manning equation by Professional Engineers for five actual centralised sewerage reticulation projects of 72,000 PE to 554,000 PE. The financial analysis revealed that capital cost saving of up to 7.6% (RM35.5 million) and 5.1% (RM23.6 million) can be achieved from the total capital cost of RM464 million for five projects, using IPFF (Babbitt) and Lee's PFF, respectively. The above findings warrant a full scale review of the current DPFF formula prescribed in MS1228:1991 for the interest of the country.

## ABSTRAK

Formula factor aliran reka bentuk puncak (DPFF) yang diperkenalkan di dalam MS1228:1991 telah diterima pakai dalam industri pembedungan Malaysia sejak diwartakan 24 tahun yang lalu walaupun formula ini tidak pernah disahkan kesahihannya. Maklum balas daripada penyelidikan tempatan dan pakar industri menunjukkan peruntukan DPFF yang tinggi menyebabkan sistem pembedungan direka melebihi kapasiti yang diperlukan dan meningkatkan kos modal serta kos operasi dan penyelenggaraan (O&M). Kerajaan Malaysia telah bercadang untuk menaikkan tarif pembedungan untuk menampung kos O&M yang tinggi untuk loji rawatan kumbahan. Memandangkan RM10.3 bilion telah diluluskan untuk projek pembedungan di bawah Rancangan Malaysia Kesepuluh, penyelidikan untuk mengoptimumkan reka bentuk dan kos sistem pembedungan adalah tepat pada masanya dan sejajar dengan keperluan negara. Matlamat penyelidikan ini adalah untuk membuktikan melalui analisis statistik bahawa DPFF adalah lebih tinggi daripada factor aliran puncak sebenar (APFF) serta factor aliran puncak antarabangsa (IPFF); mencadangkan formula factor aliran puncak (PFF) yang lebih optimum bagi menggantikan formula DPFF yang sedia ada; serta menilai kesan kewangannya ke atas projek paip pembedungan di Malaysia. Data aliran air kumbahan setiap jam telah dikumpulkan melalui meter aliran atas talian jenis electromagnet dan ultrasonik yang disambungkan kepada sistem Penyeliaan, Kawalan dan Perolehan Data (SCADA) di lima loji rawatan kumbahan berpusat (CSTP) dengan julat kapasiti daripada 73,000 sehingga 394,000 kesetaraan populasi (PE). Hasil analisis menunjukkan DPFF untuk kelima-lima CSTP adalah 23% sehingga 63% lebih tinggi daripada APFF yang dihitung. Perbandingan antara DPFF Malaysia dengan enam formula IPFF, iaitu Babbitt, Duncan, Giffit, Harmon, Johnson dan Utah menunjukkan bahawa DPFF yang digunakan di Malaysia merupakan yang paling tinggi dari 10,000 PE sehingga 1 juta PE. Selain itu, keputusan analisis juga menunjukkan APFF kepada lima CSTP adalah berhampiran dengan formula Utah, Babbitt dan Harmon. Berdasarkan APFF yang paling tinggi di antara lima CSTP, formula PFF yang lebih optimum:  $3.8/P^{0.11}$  (dinamakan sebagai Lee's PFF), dicadangkan untuk menggantikan formula DPFF yang asal iaitu  $4.7/P^{0.11}$ . Tiga formula IPFF, iaitu Babbitt, Harmon dan Utah bersama dengan Lee's PFF telah dipilih untuk analisis impak kos yang melibatkan reka bentuk kejuruteraan menggunakan formula Manning oleh jurutera profesional untuk lima projek paip pembedungan berpusat sebenar daripada 72,000 PE sehingga 554,000 PE. Analisis impak kos menunjukkan bahawa penjimatan jumlah kos modal sebanyak 7.6% (bersamaan dengan RM35.5 juta) dan 5.1% (bersamaan dengan RM23.6 juta) boleh dicapai daripada lima projek paip pembedungan yang bernilai RM464 juta dengan masing-masing menggunakan IPFF (Babbitt) dan Lee's PFF. Justeru, penemuan di atas telah menunjukkan keperluan untuk mengkaji semula formula DPFF yang ditetapkan di MS1228:1991 untuk kebaikan negara.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	ii
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	iii
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	iv
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	v
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	vi
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	vii
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xi
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xii
	<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	xiv
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xv
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xvii
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Background	1
	1.2 Problem Statements	3
	1.3 Research Questions	5
	1.4 Research Aim and Objectives	6
	1.5 Scope of Study	6
	1.6 Research Significance and Benefits	7
	1.6.1 Research Benefits to Theory/Body of Knowledge	7
	1.6.2 Research Benefits to Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd	8
	1.6.3 Research Benefits to Industry and Country	9

1.7	Operational Definitions	10
1.8	Structure of Dissertation	12
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	Introduction	13
2.2	Type of Sewerage System	13
2.3	Sewerage Service in Malaysia	15
2.3.1	Centralised and Decentralised Sewerage System	16
2.3.2	Sewerage Catchment Strategies	17
2.4	Sewage Volume, Composition, Flow and Diurnal Pattern	18
2.4.1	Statistic of Flow Statistical Data Analysis	21
2.5	Malaysian Sewage DPF	21
2.6	The Origin of Malaysian DPF	23
2.7	Previous Studies on Design Flow and DPF	23
2.8	Gap of Current Studies	26
2.9	International Peak Flow Factor (IPF)	27
2.10	Sewerage Design Criteria	28
2.10.1	Hydraulic Design	29
2.10.2	Manhole Location	29
2.10.3	Design Velocity	30
2.11	Method of Construction	31
2.12	Economic Impact Analysis	34
2.13	Economic of Scale in Sewerage Services	36
2.14	Summary of Research Gap	36
<b>3</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>38</b>
3.1	Introduction	38
3.2	Comparison of Malaysian DPF to IPF Formulas	38
3.3	Statistical Analysis of Actual Flow Data from CSTPs in Malaysia	41
3.3.1	Diurnal Flow Pattern & Selection of Daily Hourly Peak Flow	44
3.3.2	Calculation of APF	44

3.3.3	Presentation of Analysis Result	45
3.4	Financial Analysis of Impact of Different PFF to Actual Sewerage Reticulation Projects	46
3.4.1	Actual Sewerage Projects Selected	46
3.4.1.1	PS Sewerage Reticulation Project	49
3.4.1.2	DM Sewerage Reticulation Project	49
3.4.1.3	UK Sewerage Reticulation Project	50
3.4.1.4	KJ Sewerage Reticulation Project	51
3.4.1.5	PC Sewerage Reticulation Project	51
3.4.2	Components of Sewerage Reticulation Design	71
3.4.3	Engineering Approach for Sewerage Reticulation Design	71
3.4.4	Quantity Take off and Cost Estimate	76
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULT AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>78</b>
4.1	Comparison of Malaysian DPFF to IPFF Formulas	78
4.2	24-Hours Diurnal Flow Pattern for 5 CSTPs	81
4.3	Statistical Analysis of APFF from 5 CSTPs	87
4.3.1	Analysis of APF for CSTP 1(72,945 PE)	87
4.3.2	Analysis of APF for CSTP 2(167,953 PE)	89
4.3.3	Analysis of APF for CSTP 3(335,160 PE)	92
4.3.4	Analysis of APF for CSTP 4(377,414 PE)	94
4.3.5	Analysis of APF for CSTP 5(393,660 PE)	96
4.3.6	Summary of Statistical Analysis of Actual Peak Flow for 5 CSTPs	98
4.3.7	APFF for 5 CSTPs	100
4.4	Comparison of APFF, Lee's PFF and IPFF	101
4.5	Financial Impact of PFF to the Centralised Sewerage Reticulation Projects	104
4.5.1	Difference of Selected PFFs Compared to Malaysian DPFF for Sewerage Reticulation Project	104
4.5.2	Effect of PFF to the Capital Cost of the Sewerage Reticulation Projects	107



<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>119</b>
5.1	Conclusion	119
5.2	Contribution of Study to Theory and Body of Knowledge	121
5.3	Contribution of Study to Industry and Country	122
5.4	Limitation of Study	122
5.5	Recommendation for Future Study	123
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>124</b>
Appendices	A - C	130-167

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	IPFF formulas selected for comparison with Malaysian DPFF	39
3.2	Summary of details of 5 CSTPs selected in analysis	43
3.3	Summary of sewerage zones within 5 sewerage catchments adopted in financial analysis	46
3.4	Summary of key design criteria for sewerage reticulation design	75
4.1	Summary of raw data collection from 5 CSTPs	81
4.2	Summary of data distribution of flow data to CSTP1	89
4.3	Summary of data distribution of flow data to CSTP2	91
4.4	Summary of data distribution of flow data to CSTP3	93
4.5	Summary of data distribution of flow data to CSTP4	95
4.6	Summary of data distribution of flow data to CSTP5	97
4.7	The distribution of daily peak flow data for 5 CSTPs	98
4.8	Summary of APFF for 5 CSTPs against the DPFF	100
4.9	Comparison between Malaysian DPFF against IPFFs & Lee's PFF for 16 Sewerage zones within 5 projects	105
4.10	Project capital cost for 16 sewerage zones designed using Malaysian DPFF, Lee's PFF and IPFF formulas	108
4.11	Summary of Financial Analysis for 5 Sewerage Projects	114

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	Layout plan showing location of 5 centralised sewerage reticulation projects	53
3.2	Overall layout plan showing PS sewerage reticulation system	54
3.3	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PS-T	55
3.4	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PS-O, PS-N, PS-Q, PS-R & PS-S	56
3.5	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PS-P	57
3.6	Overall layout plan showing DM sewerage reticulation system	58
3.7	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at DM-1	59
3.8	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at DM-2	60
3.9	Overall layout plan showing UK sewerage reticulation system	61
3.10	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at UK-1	62
3.11	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at UK-3	63
3.12	Overall layout plan showing KJ sewerage reticulation system	64
3.13	Layout plan showing sewerage system at KJ-1	65
3.14	Layout plan showing sewerage system at KJ-3	66
3.15	Overall layout plan showing PC sewerage reticulation system	67
3.16	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PC-1	68
3.17	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PC-2	69
3.18	Layout plan showing sewerage reticulation system at PC-3	70
3.19	Standard hydraulic calculation spreadsheet (by SSP) adopted in sewer design	74
3.20	Example of BQ adopted in financial analysis for 16 sewerage Zones	77

4.1	Comparison of Malaysian DPFF with IPFF and proposed Rahman <i>et al.</i> (2007) PFF	79
4.2	24 hours diurnal flow pattern for CSTP1	82
4.3	24 hours diurnal flow pattern for CSTP2	83
4.4	24 hours diurnal flow pattern for CSTP3	84
4.5	24 hours diurnal flow pattern for CSTP4	85
4.6	24 hours diurnal flow pattern for CSTP5	86
4.7	APF vs DPF for CSTP1	87
4.8	Box plot for distribution of flow data to CSTP1	88
4.9	APF vs DPF for CSTP2	90
4.10	Box plot for distribution of flow data to CSTP2	91
4.11	APF vs DPF for CSTP3	92
4.12	Box plot for distribution of flow data to CSTP3	93
4.13	APF vs DPF for CSTP4	94
4.14	Box plot for distribution of flow data to CSTP4	95
4.15	APF vs DPF for CSTP5	96
4.16	Box plot for distribution of flow data to CSTP5	97
4.17	Box plot showing distribution of flow data in percentile compared to the DPF	99
4.18	Comparison of APFF from 5 CSTPs to IPFF & Malaysian DPFF	102
4.19	Comparison of Malaysian DPFF to IPFFs & Lee's PFF for the 16 sewerage zones and 5 project	106
4.20	Capital cost for 16 sewerage zones designed using Malaysian DPFF, IPFFs (Utah, Babbitt & Harmon) and Lee's PFF	111
4.21	Saving of capital cost for 16 sewerage zones designed using IPFFs (Utah, Babbitt & Harmon) and Lee's PFF as compared to that of Malaysian DPFF	112
4.22	Summary of capital cost saving for 5 sewerage catchments designed using 3 IPFFs (as compared to that of the original Malaysian DPFF)	115

**LIST OF SYMBOLS**

A	-	Flow Area
k	-	Peak Flow Factor
km	-	Kilometer
l/s	-	liter/second
mm	-	Millimeter
m	-	Meter
m <sup>3</sup> /day	-	Meter Cubed per Day
m <sup>3</sup> /hr	-	Meter Cubed per Hour
m/s	-	Meter per Second
n	-	Manning's Roughness Coefficient
P	-	Estimated Population Equivalent (PE in thousands)
Q	-	Flow Rate
Q <sub>peak hourly</sub>	-	Peak Hourly Flow Rate
R	-	Hydraulic Radius
S	-	Channel Slope
v	-	Velocity
%	-	Percentage
Δ	-	Difference

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AMN	-	Ammoniacal Nitrogen
APF	-	Actual Peak Flow
APFF	-	Actual Peak Flow Factor
BOD <sub>5</sub>	-	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
BQ	-	Bill of Quantity
COD	-	Chemical Oxygen Demand
CST	-	Communal Septic Tanks
CSTP	-	Centralised Sewage Treatment Plant
DAF	-	Design Average Flow
DPF	-	Design Peak Flow
DO	-	Dissolved Oxygen
DPFF	-	Design Peak Flow Factor
EPU	-	Economic Planning Unit
HDPE	-	High Density Polyethylene Pipe
IL	-	Invert Level
IPFF	-	International Peak Flow Factor
IST	-	Individual Septic Tanks
IWK	-	Indah Water Konsortium
JPP	-	Jabatan Perkhidmatan Pembetulan
KeTTHA	-	Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water Malaysia
KL	-	Kuala Lumpur
KLCC	-	Kuala Lumpur Convention Center
KTM	-	Keretapi Tanah Melayu
LRT	-	Light Railway Transit
M&E	-	Mechanical & Electrical

MLSS	-	Mix Liquor Suspended Solids
MOHE	-	Ministry of Higher Education
MSIG	-	Malaysian Sewerage Industry Guidelines
NPS	-	Network Pump Station
O&G	-	Oil & Grease
O&M	-	Operation and Maintenance
PE	-	Population Equivalent
PFF	-	Peak Flow Factor
PLC	-	Programmable Logic Controller
QS	-	Quantity Surveyors
RCP	-	Reinforced Concrete Pipe
RMK 9	-	Ninth Malaysian Plan
RMK 10	-	Tenth Malaysian Plan
RMK 11	-	Eleventh Malaysian Plan
SCADA	-	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SCCF	-	Sewerage Capital Contribution Fund
SCS	-	Sewerage Catchment Strategy
SPAN	-	Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara
SS	-	Suspended Solid
SSD	-	Sewerage Service Department
SSP	-	Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd
STP	-	Sewage Treatment Plant
TN	-	Total Nitrogen
TP	-	Total Phosphorus
UK	-	United Kingdom
UTM	-	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
VCP	-	Vitrified Clay Pipe
WTP	-	Wastewater Treatment Plant
WSIA	-	Water Services Industry Act

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Hydraulic Design Calculation for Sewer Network	130
B	Quantity Take Off Sheet	137
C	Tender Bill of Quantity	147



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background

In the past century, the primary objective of sewerage services in Malaysia was for public health care, mainly focus on the control of waterborne diseases due to discharge of untreated sewage. In line with the Government's vision for Malaysia to become a developed nation by 2020, the sewerage objective has been upgraded towards the environmental protection; whereby more attention is given to the compliances of sewage treatment plant (STP) discharge to regulatory requirement, i.e. meeting more stringent effluent standard (SSD, 1999). This can be seen with the enactment of Environment Quality (Sewage) Regulation, 2009 (Malaysia, 2009) with more stringent treated effluent standard to substitute the Environment Quality Act 1974.

“Guidelines for Developers” published by Sewerage Services Department (SSD) in 1999 which was later revised as the “Malaysian Sewerage Industry Guideline” (MSIG) by the *Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara* (SPAN), in 2009 had been commonly adopted by the sewerage industry in Malaysia for the planning, design, authority submission, construction, handing over, operation, maintenance etc of sewerage services (SSD, 1999 & SPAN, 2009a & 2009b).

It was stated in SSD's guideline (1999) that the future direction of sewerage infrastructures shall be towards rationalisation of multi points STP into centralised sewerage treatment plants (CSTP). The continuation of this vision can be seen in the SSD's annual report 2011, whereby the following long term national sewerage plan was set up by SSD:

- i. To increase coverage of sewerage network in urban catchment from 60% to 87% connected population equivalent (PE) by 2040.
- ii. To decommission and rationalize small STP to be replaced by CSTP in order to increase PE coverage of centralized sewerage system from 19% in 2008 to 79% by 2040. It was stated that the number of CSTP was estimated to increase to 223 plants by 2040.
- iii. Higher compliances to effluent standard.
- iv. Promoting green technologies in sewerage industry.
- v. To replace the existing sub-standard septic tanks (5 million units septic tanks were estimated in 2007) with better on site treatment system to meet effluent standard for the needs of semi urban or rural catchment

In line with the national sewerage plan, the Eleventh Malaysian Plan (RMK 11) for 2016-2020 published by the Prime Minister's Department of Malaysia, has reported that 3000 individual STPs was identified for rationalisation into centralised sewerage system in order to reduce the operation and maintenance (O&M) cost by approximately 50% (mainly for power consumption and labour cost) besides achieving higher treatability to produce better effluent quality. It was revealed that the annual O&M cost for 6000 multi points STPs in 2010 was in the range of RM1-3 million each, which is a financial burden to the country (EPU, 2015a & 2015b).

According to the annual reports published by SSD and Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water Malaysia (KeTTHA), the Government of Malaysia has allocated approximately RM4.5 billion (from 2006-2013) under the Ninth and Tenth Malaysia Plan (RMK 9 & RMK 10) from 2006 to 2015 to SSD for implementation of sewerage projects nationwide (SSD, 2011-2014 and KeTTHA, 2014). It was reported that the total 22 sewerage projects under Greater Kuala Lumpur/ Klang

Valley with total estimated project cost of RM5.6 billion had been approved in December 2010 to be implemented in stages (SSD, 2011). It was also revealed by the Economic Planning Unit (EPU) under the Prime Minister's Department of Malaysia that sewerage projects with total value of RM10.3 billion was approved under the RMK 10 to modernise sewerage infrastructure in Malaysia (EPU, 2015a).

Besides the allocation from the federal government, the sewerage projects are being implemented via developers funding and the funding of "Sewerage Capital Contribution Fund" (SCCF) managed by SPAN. According to the annual report published by SPAN, the amount of SCCF was reported as RM 562 million as at end of 2013 (SPAN, 2014).

From the above background, it was indicated that Malaysian sewerage strategy is migrating from decentralised system towards centralised system since the past decade, for better treatability and higher efficiency. The continuation of this direction is expected in the next decades to achieve the Government's long term vision of sustainable sewerage system. Besides, it was noted that huge allocation in terms of billion ringgits has been channelled to the sewerage industry in the past decade and more is expected in future. Thus the research on cost optimisation in sewerage industry is timely and in line with the country's need.

## **1.2 Problem Statements**

In Malaysia, the Government emphasizes a lot on the quality of treated effluent from STP via more stringent effluent standards such as Environmental Quality (Sewage) Regulation 2009; however, no attention was given to the design flow of sewerage services especially the accuracy of the design peak flow factor (DPFF) adopted in the sewerage industry. Globally, much research had been done on the treatment processes, but very limited literature is available on the project costs in relation to the design flow and government policy (Eran and EHUD, 2006).

The DPF formula prescribed in MS1228:1991 (SIRIM, 1991) has been adopted in the entire Malaysian sewerage industry. The same DPF formula was also recommended in SSD and SPAN's guidelines (SSD, 1999 & SPAN, 2009a & 2009b). It should be noted that MS1228:1991 (SIRIM, 1991) has never been revised in the past 24 years since its publication. It was stated in SSD (1999) that the DPF formula prescribed in MS1228:1991 is a predictive equation which has yet to be validated during the time of study, sewerage designers are allowed to use other equation which is valid and appropriate for a particular sewerage catchment. Unfortunately the above statement was unnoticed by all parties in the sewerage industry in Malaysia.

The impact of the DPF to the sewerage industry is tremendous as it affect the sizing of the entire sewerage services including the secondary sewer, trunk sewer, force main, network pump station (NPS), STP etc whereby every component (civil and structure works as well as process, mechanical and electrical equipment) in the sewerage services are designed with additional capacity via the DPF. However, based on the feedback from the industry, the DPF recommended in the Malaysian sewerage design guideline is excessive and has not been achieved in actual flow condition in STP (Lim *et al.*, 2014). In addition, the result published by local researchers had further supported the claim by the industry that the DPF had been over provided. According to these studies, the actual peak flow factor (APFF) and actual per capita flow in sanitary sewers were lower compared to the DPF provided in Malaysian Standard MS1228:1991. As a result, sewerage system tends to be over designed and contributed to the increase in overall capital cost (Rahman *et al.*, 2007, Kamran *et al.*, 2013; Su & Ng, 2013; Su *et al.*, 2014). Besides, during the post construction stage, the sewerage services have not been fully utilized and most of the equipment is not operating at its optimum design efficiency. This has contributed to higher O&M cost for the entire service life of the sewerage utilities.

The EPU (2015b) has reported in the "Strategy Paper 16: Ensuring Quality and Efficient Water and Sewerage Services", 2015 that the two main challenges of sewerage services in Malaysia are as below:

- i. High O&M cost whereby the revenue from sewerage tariff cannot cover the basic O&M cost of RM1 to 3 million per annum for each of the 6000 public STPs, hence the Government has to subsidize the concessionaire STP operators;
- ii. Pollution to water body whereby 47.8% of point source pollution was caused by poorly operated multi point STPs. In addition, the pollution caused by non point source from septic tank and pour flush is immeasurable.

In order to improve the sustainability of the sewerage industry in Malaysia, EPU (2015b) has recommended in the strategy paper that the sewerage tariff shall be increased to reflect the actual O&M cost. In other words, the additional cost due to inefficiency in O&M of sewerage services especially STPs due to whatsoever reasons (including inaccuracy of DPF) will be eventually paid by consumers.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

From the problem statement, the key research questions to be addressed in the research approach are as below:

- i. Is the APFF to the sewerage services in Malaysia lower than the DPF?
- ii. Is the Malaysian DPF higher as compared to international peak flow factor (IPFF)?
- iii. How much capital cost saving can be achieved in the sewerage reticulation projects in Malaysia if a more optimised peak flow factor (PF), which is closer to the APFF is being adopted?

## 1.4 Research Aim and Objectives

The aim of this research is to prove that the DPFF adopted in the sewerage services is over provided as compared to the APFF and to evaluate its financial effect to the sewerage reticulation projects. The objectives of this study are as follow:

- i. To analyze the APFF to sewerage system in Malaysia as compared to the DPFF and to recommend a more optimised PFF formula based on APFF
- ii. To identify the standing of Malaysian DPFF formula (SIRIM, 1991) as compared to IPFF formulas;
- iii. To assess the effect of the DPFF to the capital cost of sewerage reticulation projects

## 1.5 Scope of Study

The scope of this study shall include data collection from supervisory, control and data acquisition (SCADA) system of 5 selected large capacity CSTPs in Klang Valley and Penang. According to sustainability report 2012-2013 (IWK, 2014), there are 35 numbers of big STPs with capacity greater than 50,000 PE in Malaysia.

Statistical analysis of hourly flow data collected from the 5 CSTPs shall be conducted to calculate the APFF for the 5 CSTPs against their respective DPFF values. Based on the APFF for the 5 CSTPs, a more optimised PFF formula in lieu of the current DPFF formula shall be recommended. In addition, the calculated APFF for 5 CSTPs shall be compared against 6 IPFF formulas namely, Babbitt, Duncan, Giffit, Harmon, Johson, and Utah, besides Malaysian DPFF to evaluate the standing of APFF and DPFF against the IPFFs. From the comparison, 3 IPFFs closer to the APFF shall be shortlisted together with the proposed optimised PFF formula, for redesign of sewerage reticulation system by Professional Engineers using Manning equation, via standard engineering approach for 5 actual turnkey centralised sewerage projects (comprises 16 sewerage zones) undertaken by one of the largest

engineering consulting firm in Malaysia, i.e. Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd (SSP). Upon completion of redesign, engineers shall carry out quantity take off and update the actual tender bill of quantities (BQ) with quantities and standard rate published by the SSD (SSD, 2009) to obtain new capital cost for the sewerage projects under respective IPFFs. Cost comparison of capital cost generated from different PFFs for 5 sewerage projects in Malaysia as compared to that of the original design with DPFF shall be elaborated.

## **1.6 Research Significance and Benefits**

This research is conducted under the Engineering Doctorate program with collaboration between SSP from the industry and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) under the Industrial PhD scholarship by Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) of Malaysia. With the university-industry collaboration, this study shall make use of the advantage of having actual sewerage projects undertaken by SSP in addition to UTM's strength as a research university. In addition, the engineering design skill held by the engineers (under supervision of Professional Engineers) in SSP shall be fully utilised in this research. The significance and benefits of this research shall be discussed in three categories, i.e. benefits to theory/ body of knowledge; benefits to the company and benefits to the industry and country.

### **1.6.1 Research Benefits to Theory/ Body of Knowledge**

In this research, the current Malaysian DPFF prescribed in the MS122: 1991 and SPAN's MSIG (2009) which has never been tested shall be validated via actual flow data from the CSTP. From the findings from this research, a more optimised DPFF formula (which is closer to APFF) shall be recommended which will be beneficial to the theory and body of knowledge. The future researcher can further verified the proposed PFF formula against more actual flow data using the same approach.

### **1.6.2 Research Benefits to Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn. Bhd.**

SSP is the longest established engineering consulting firm in Malaysia, with more than 90 years experience. SSP was founded by Mr Steen Sehested, a Danish Engineer in 1924. The company was later renamed as Steen Sehested and Partners in 1960s before it was registered as the current Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd in 1970s. SSP is a multi-discipline engineering consulting firm with more than 200 engineers (over 400 staffs), is also currently one of the largest engineering consulting firm in the country. Throughout the past 90 over years, SSP has successfully completed various projects in public and private sectors for its Clients and at the same time produce competence engineers to the industry via on job training.

SSP has undertaken some of the major sewerage projects in Malaysia and overseas such as 350,000PE Bayan Baru CSTP, 1.2 millionPE Jelutong CSTP, 900,000PE Yen So CSTP, Vietnam, 750,000PE Bunus CSTP, Kota Kinabalu sewerage projects, Petaling Jaya South sewerage reticulation project, Puchong sewerage reticulation project etc. From the vast experience in sewerage projects completed by SSP throughout the years, it is the professional responsibility of SSP as one of the leading consultant in the country to publish the project knowledge and experience in order to assist the authority to improve the current design guideline or standards and at the same time to improve the industrial's engineering design practice for the best interest of the country. In addition, the following are the benefits of the research to the company:

- i. SSP's engineers may gain extra knowledge via in depth study on the engineering problems and solution in this research that enhance the competency of the engineers.
- ii. research will encourage the publication culture among the engineers in the company.
- iii. While meeting the business objectives of the company, the knowledge and experience from projects can be shared via publication in order to achieve cost optimisation and better efficiency in the sewerage services i.e. sewerage network and STP etc in future.



### 1.6.3 Research Benefits to Industry and Country

This research shall benefit the sewerage industry and country on the following:

- i. To confirm the hypothesis that the DPF<sub>F</sub> prescribed in MS1228:1991 and SPAN guideline is over provided as compared to APF<sub>F</sub> and to evaluate the financial impact of the PFF to sewerage projects.
- ii. Based on the above findings, it is expected that the saving in capital cost of the sewerage projects can be achieved via adopting a more optimised PFF in lieu of the current DPF<sub>F</sub>.
- iii. It is believed that the findings of this study can convince the policy maker i.e. SPAN as the regulatory body in water and sewerage industry, on the substantiate amount of potential cost saving in the capital cost of sewerage projects in view of the RM10.3 billion sewerage projects have been recently approved by the Government under the RMK 10.
- iv. Besides, the high O&M cost due to low operating efficiency of sewerage process mechanical and electrical (M&E) equipment as a result of over sizing of equipment can be avoided in future by adopting a more optimised DPF<sub>F</sub>.
- v. Further to the research findings, further study is recommended especially on a nationwide scale DPF<sub>F</sub> to suit different sewerage catchment characteristic. Besides, further research on financial impact of PFF to the O&M cost in sewerage services i.e. NPS and STP shall benefit the industry in lowering the O&M cost in long run which will ease the financial burden of the Government and consumers.

Hopefully with the findings and recommendation from this research, SPAN with the support from the universities, STP operators and industries will initiate a full scale nationwide study to revise the current DPF<sub>F</sub> formula to reflect the actual flow characteristic of various sewerage services. This will benefit the entire industry and country in long term.

## 1.7 Operational Definitions

This dissertation is very specific to the sewerage industry in Malaysia. In order to help the reader to understand this dissertation, the operational definition (in the point of view of a wastewater engineer) for some of the technical terminology used in this dissertation are defined as below:

- i. **Sewerage system:** normally used to describe the entire system that conveys the sewage generated from its source to the treatment plant. Thus it normally comprises sewerage reticulation, network pump station and sewage treatment plant.
- ii. **Sewerage Reticulation:** also known as sewer network, comprises sewer (pipe) connected to the individual households (known as **secondary sewer**) to the bigger diameter sewer (known as **trunk sewer**). The combination of secondary sewers and trunk sewers is generally known as “sewerage reticulation” system. “Reticulation” is also commonly used in other infrastructure works such as water supply (as water reticulation system) and drainage system (as drainage reticulation system).
- iii. **Gravity Sewer:** sewerage reticulation system is normally design to flow by natural gravity whereby the sewage flows from high point to low point via sewer laid with minimum gradient to achieve self cleansing velocity of 0.8 m/s. The sewer laid to flow by gravity is named as “Gravity Sewer”. Gravity sewer can be constructed via open cut method or pipe jacking method, depends on the suitability of the site and the depth of pipe.
- iv. **Network Pump Station (NPS):** The invert level of the gravity sewer will get deeper with the increase length of collection sewer, when the depth of sewer reach a maximum depth set by authority (approximately 8m to 10m below ground level), NPS is normally introduced to lift up the sewage to a shallower invert level at a receiving manhole at suitable location and continue to flow by gravity to the designated destination. Besides, NPS is also introduced to suit the requirement of certain site topography such as river crossing,

railway crossing, hill crossing etc. Sewerage designer will try to avoid NPS as much as possible as NPS will require life time operation and maintenance.

- v. **Force Main:** the pipe in between a NPS and the receiving manhole is called force main. Force Main is operated by pressure created by the pumps in the NPS. As the force main is a pressurised sewer, it does not need to be laid with minimum gradient which is required in gravity sewer. Thus force main is normally laid at a shallower depth from the ground levels; it is normally constructed via open cut method.
- vi. **STP:** is the final destination of the sewerage system whereby the sewage generated from its sources will be treated in STP to the effluent standard required under the law before released to the downstream water courses.
- vii. **Diurnal Flow:** 24 hours diurnal flow in sewerage system is normally used to describe the 24 hour trend of average hourly flow (in m<sup>3</sup>/hr) for a period of time. The diurnal flow normally comprises high point and low points at different hour of the day.
- viii. **Quantity Take Off:** is an approach commonly used by Consulting Engineers or Quantity Surveyors (QS) to calculate the quantity of materials required in a particular scope according to the size and category of respective materials as shown on Tender Drawings. During the quantity take off, engineers/ QS will normally use a take-off sheet in the form of table to record the quantity before it is transferred into the Tender Bill of Quantities (BQ)
- ix. **BQ:** is an important section in a tender document, whereby the design engineer/ QS has itemised the material or scope of work required with sufficient description and quantities to enable the Tenderers to price in their rate. The tender amount for each item will be calculated via multiplying the rate and the quantities stated in the BQ. The final cumulative amount developed from the BQ will form the Tender price (under a conventional contract)

## **1.8 Structure of Dissertation**

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 is the introductory chapter, which describes the research background, problem statements, objectives to be achieved, research significance and benefits, scope of research and the structure of the dissertation. Literature review in Chapter 2 presents the topics related to the research project including the sewage flow, PFF formulas adopted in sewerage industry etc.

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology employed i.e. the data processing and analysis to calculate the APFF for CSTPs, engineering approach in redesign of sewerage projects and financial analysis via actual Turnkey tender BQ to evaluate the cost implication.

In Chapter 4, the result of statistical analysis to calculate the APFF in selected CSTP and subsequent financial analysis on 5 actual sewerage projects using 3 selected IPFF formulas shall be presented. Chapter 5 summarises the results and findings obtained from the previous chapters. This chapter also highlights contributions to the knowledge and industry besides giving recommendations for further study.

## REFERENCES

- AECOM (2013). *Sanitary Servicing Master Plan Design Criteria Memo Volume III Appendix 1. Canada*. Retrieved on February 11, 2016, from [http://www.cambridge.ca/relatedDocs/Vol%20III%20Appen%201%20Design%20Criteria%20Memo\\_121224\\_final.pdf](http://www.cambridge.ca/relatedDocs/Vol%20III%20Appen%201%20Design%20Criteria%20Memo_121224_final.pdf)
- AMEC Environment & Infrastructure (2012). *Intensification/Infill Study – Background Report*. Retrieved on February 11, 2016, from [http://www.brantford.ca/Projects%20%20Initiatives%20%20Intensification%20Strategy/Amec%20-%20Servicing%20Report%20\(March%202012\).pdf](http://www.brantford.ca/Projects%20%20Initiatives%20%20Intensification%20Strategy/Amec%20-%20Servicing%20Report%20(March%202012).pdf)
- Babbitt, H.E., and Baumann, E.R. (1958) *Sewerage and Sewage Treatment* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.) New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Bergeson, W. (2014). Review of Long Drive Microtunneling Technology for Use on Large Scale Projects. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 39(2014), 66–72.
- Bewszko, T., and Slys, D. (2014). Multi-criteria Decision Aid for the Selection of Open Trenching Technology for Modernisation of Municipal Infrastructure Systems. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 39 (2014), 94–101.
- Bottero, M., and Peila, D. (2005). The Use of the Analytic Hierarchy Process for the Comparison between Microtunneling and Trench Excavation. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 20 (2005), 501–513.
- British Standard Institute (1983). *B.S. 6297 Design and Installation of Small Sewage Treatment Works and Cesspools*. BSI Standards Limited.
- British Standard Institute (2008). *B.S. EN 752: Drain and Sewer Systems Outside Buildings*. BSI Standards Limited.
- Duncan, M. (1978). *Sewage Treatment in Hot Climates*. (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.) London: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department (2015). *Eleventh Malaysia Plan: 2016-2020*. Malaysia: Percetakan Nasional Malaysia Berhad.

- Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department (2015). *Strategy Paper 16: Ensuring Quality and Efficient Water and Sewerage Services*. Retrieve on July 3, 2015, from <http://rmk11.epu.gov.my/pdf/strategy-paper/Strategy%20Paper%2016.pdf>
- Eran, F., and Ehud, P.(2006). Effects of Design Flow and Treatment Level on Construction and Operation Costs of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants and Their Implications on Policy Making. *Water Research*, 40 (2006), 3751-3758.
- European Standard (1996). *BSEN752-2: Drain and Sewer Systems Outside Buildings*. BSI Standards Limited.
- Geoffrey F.R. (2004). *Open-cut and Heading Construction*. In Geoffrey F.R.. *Sewers-Replacement & New Construction* (pp.132-149). Oxford Elsevier: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Giffit, H.M. (1945). Estimating Variations in Domestic Sewage Flows. *Water Works & Sewerage*, May 1945, 175-177.
- Giorgio, M., and Gaspare, V. (2009). Separate and Combined Sewer Systems: A Long-term Modelling Approach. *Water Science & Technology*, Vol. 60.3 (2009), 555-565.
- Greater Sudbury Engineering Services Division (2012). *Engineering Design Manual*. Retrieve on February 11, 2016, from <https://www.greatersudbury.ca/linkservid/FF10C348-9ED2-B71D-B7F8747AF1797D3F/showMeta/0/>
- Hamid, H., Narayana, D., and Bai, S.A. (2009). Centralized and Decentralized Wastewater Management in Malaysia – Experiences and Challenges (Part 1). *The Ingenieur*, Board of Engineer Malaysia, Volume 42, 18-23.
- Hamid, H., Narayana, D., and Bai, S.A. (2009). Centralized and Decentralized Wastewater Management in Malaysia – Experiences and Challenges (Part 2). *The Ingenieur*, Board of Engineer Malaysia, Volume 43, 37-44.
- Harmon, W.G. (1918). Forecasting Sewage at Toledo under Dry Weather Condition. *Engineering News Record*, 80, 1233.
- Henze, M. (2000). *Wastewater, Volumes and Composition*. In Henze, M., Harremoes, P., Jansen, J.L.C. and Arvin, E. (Ed. 3) *Wastewater Treatment: Biological and Chemical Processes* (pp.11-41). Lyngby: Springer.
- Homer W.P, (1975). *Wastewater Systems Engineering*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Ian, V. (2004). *Aspects of Sewer Design*. In Geoffrey F.R. *Sewers-Replacement & New Construction* (pp.116-131). Oxford Elsevier: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Imam, E.H., and Elnakar, H.Y. (2014). Design Flow Factors for Sewerage Systems in Small Arid Communities. *Journal of Advanced Research*, 5, 537-542.
- Indah Water Konsortium (2014). *Sustainability Report 2012-2013*. Retrieve on February 11, 2016, from [https://www.iwk.com.my/cms/upload\\_files/resource/sustainabilityreport/Sustainability\\_Report2012\\_2013.pdf](https://www.iwk.com.my/cms/upload_files/resource/sustainabilityreport/Sustainability_Report2012_2013.pdf)
- Johnson, C.F. (1942). Relation between Average and Extreme Sewage Flow Rates. *Engineering News Record*, 129, 500-501.
- Kamran, A., Almani, Z.A., and Memon, N.A. (2013). Estimation of Parameters and Flow Characteristics for the Design of Sanitary Sewers in Malaysia. *Mehran University Research Journal of Engineering & Technology*, Volume 32, 95-102.
- Lim, P.L., Cheok, H.L., Eng, W.E., and Ong, C.A. (2014). *Excessive Design Peak Flow Factor in Malaysian Design Guideline*. Unpublished note, Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd.
- Lim, P.L. (2015). *Sewerage Capital Investment by Private Developers*. Unpublished note, Sepakat Setia Perunding Sdn Bhd.
- Lim, C.L. (2016). *Instrumentations Used in Sewage Treatment Plant in Malaysia*. Unpublished note, Hydro-Trend (M) Sdn Bhd.
- Malaysia (1978). *Environment Quality (Sewage and Industrial Effluent) Regulation 1978, Environmental Quality Act 1974*. P.U.(A) 12/1979.
- Malaysia (2009). *Environmental Quality (Sewage) Regulations 2009, Environmental Quality Act 1974*. P.U.(A)432.
- Malaysia (1993). *Sewerage Services Act 2006*. SSA 1993.
- Malaysia (2006). *Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara Act 2006*. Act 654.
- Malaysia (2006). *Water Services Industry Act 2006*. Act 655.
- Marleni, N., Gray, S., Sharma, A., Burn, S., and Muttill, N. (2015). Impact of Water Management Practice Scenarios on Wastewater Flow and Contaminant Concentration. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 151 (2015), 461-471.
- Matthew, J.C., Allouche, E.N. & Sterling, R.L. (2015). Social Cost Impact Assessment of Pipeline Infrastructure Projects. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 50 (2015), 196–202.

- McKim, R.A. (1997). Bidding Strategies for Conventional and Trenchless Technologies Considering Social Costs. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 24(5), 819–827.
- Metcalf and Eddy (2004). *Wastewater Engineering, Treatment and Reuse*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Mc Graw Hill Publication.
- Milligan, G.W.E. and Norris, P. (1996). Site-based Research in Pipe Jacking-Objectives, Procedures and A Case History. *Trenchless Technol. Res.*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 3-24.
- Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water (KeTTHA) (2014). *Annual Report 2013. Malaysia*: Ministry of Energy, Green Technology and Water.
- Moulton, R.B. (1999). *Peaking Factor in Sanitary Sewer Design*. Master Thesis, College of Engineering and Technology Brigham Young University Provo, Utah.
- Nia, S. and Othman, F. (2012). Cost Analysis of Pipes for Application in Sewage Systems. *Materials and Design*, 33(2012), 356-361.
- Niemczynowics, J. (1997). The Water Profession and Agenda 21. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 7(1), 63-84.
- Peavy, H.S., Rowe, D.R., and Tchobanoglous, G. (1988). *Environmental Engineering International Edition*. New York: McGraw Hill Publication.
- Rahman N.A., Alias N., Salleh, S.S.M., and Samion, M.K.H. (2007). *Evaluation of Design Criteria for Inflow & Infiltration of Medium Scale Sewerage Catchment System*, Research Vote No. 74281, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Sancho, F.H., Senante, M.M., and Garrido, R.S., (2010). Cost Modeling for Wastewater Treatment Processes. *Desalination*, 268 (2011), 1-5.
- Schreyer, J. (1998). GSTT Investigation: Guidelines for Selecting Construction Methods for Earth-laid Lines. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 129-130.
- Senante, M.M., Sancho, F.H., and Garrido, R.S. (2010). Economic Feasibility Study for Wastewater Treatment: A Cost-benefit Analysis. *Science of Total Environment*, 408 (2010), 4396-4402.
- Senante, M.M., Sancho, F.H., and Garrido, R.S. (2011). Cost-benefit Analysis of Water-reuse Projects for Environmental Purposes: A Case Study for Spanish Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 92 (2011), 3091-3097.



- Sewerage Services Department, Ministry of Housing and Local Government (1999). *Guidelines for Developers: Sewerage Policy for New Developments*. Malaysia: Sewerage Service Department.
- Sewerage Service Department (2009). *Schedule of Rates Year 2009*. Malaysia: Contract and Quantity Survey Division.
- Sewerage Service Department, Ministry of Energy, Green Energy and Water (2011). *Annual Report 2010*. Malaysia: Sewerage Service Department.
- Sewerage Service Department, Ministry of Energy, Green Energy and Water (2012). *Annual Report 2011*. Malaysia: Sewerage Service Department.
- Sewerage Service Department, Ministry of Energy, Green Energy and Water (2013). *Annual Report 2012*. Malaysia: Sewerage Service Department.
- Sewerage Service Department, Ministry of Energy, Green Energy and Water (2014). *Annual Report 2013*. Malaysia: Sewerage Service Department.
- Sohaimi, K. (2007). *Determination of Domestic Wastewater Characteristic and Its Relation to the Type and Size of Developments*. Master Thesis, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Sofianos, A.I., Loukas, P., and Chantzakos, Ch. (2004). Pipe Jacking A Sewer Under Athens. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology*, 19 (2004), 193–203.
- Standards & Industrial Research Institute of Malaysia (SIRIM) (1991). *M.S. 1228: Code of Practice for Design and Installation of Sewerage Systems*. Malaysia: SIRIM.
- Su, K.N., and Ng, S.P. (2013). *An Evaluation of the Design Criterion for Sewerage Peak Flow Factor at Segi University Hostel*. *SEGi Review*, Volume 6, 1985-5672.
- Su, K.N., Othman, N., and Ghani, N.A. (2014). Investigation of Sewage Flows in Universiti Malaysia Pahang's Sewerage System. *8<sup>th</sup> Malaysian Technical Universities Conference on Engineering and Technology (MUCET 2014)*. 10-11 November. Melaka.
- Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara (SPAN) (2009). *Malaysian Sewerage Industry Guidelines Volume III: Sewer Network & Pump Stations (3rd Ed.)*. Selangor: SPAN.

- Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara (SPAN) (2009). Malaysian Sewerage Industry Guidelines Volume IV: Sewage Treatment Plant. (3rd Ed.). Selangor: SPAN.*
- Suruhanjaya Perkhidmatan Air Negara (SPAN) (2014). Sewerage Capital Contribution Fund-Annual Report 2013. Selangor: SPAN.*
- Ujang, Z., and Henze, M.(2006). *Sustainable sanitation for developing countries*. In Ujang Z. and Henze, M. *Municipal Wastewater Management in Developing Countries* (pp.1-16). London: IWA Publishing.
- Ujang, Z. (2006). *Strategy and Planning of Sewerage Infrastructures for Developing Countries: Experience of Malaysia*. In Ujang Z. and Henze, M. *Municipal Wastewater Management in Developing Countries* (pp.46-69). London: IWA Publishing.
- Water Reclamation (Network) Department, Singapore (2004). *Code of Practice on Sewerage and Sanitary Works*. Singapore: WR(N)D, Singapore.
- Wei, Y.S., Fan, Y.B., and Wang, M.J. (2001). A Cost Analysis of Sewage Sludge Composting for Small and Mid-scale Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 33(2001), 203-216.
- Yuan, Z.W., Zhang, L., and Bi, J. (2010). Which Is More Cost-effective? A Comparison of Two Wastewater Treatment Models in China-Singapore Shuzhou Industrial Park, China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18 (2010), 1270-1275.
- Zhang, X.Y., Buchberger, S., and Van Zyl, J. (2005). A Theoretical Explanation for Peaking Factors. *World Water and Environmental Resources Congress*. Alaska, USA, 1-12.
- Zhang, X.Y. (2005). *Estimating Peaking Factors with Poisson Rectangular Pulse Model and Extreme Value Theory*. Master Thesis, University of Cincinnati, USA.