# BACKGROUND INFORMATION USED IN DESIGN CALCULATIONS

# Sluice gate design

This design is based on a fully-flowing pipe formula, suitable for concrete or other pipe-type sluices

asic	ata

Area of system to be served, ha	10.000	Pipe internal dia. metres :	0.750
Minimum acceptable exchange rate/per day	0.200	Number of pipes	1.000
Average depth of pond system, metres	1.000	Pipe length metres	12.000
Pond base datum point (PB), metres	2.300	Friction factor	0.030
Tide curve datum point (TC), metres	0.000	Entrance coefficient	0.500
Starting inner level, metres (PB)	0.600	Discharge coefficient	0.7 II
Critical tide, lower level (TC)	1.500	Scouring velocity rn/sec	0.500
Critical tide, upper level (TC)	3.750		

**Tidal Curve Data** 

Time	Degrees	TC	PB	Mean lvi	Sluice	Flow rate	tnti	Flow	Velocity	Protec-
(Hrs.)		(rn)	(m)	PB (m)	position	m3/sec	lvi	status	rn/sec	tion
							(m)			length
.000	.000	1.500	800			.000	.600		.000	.000
.500	7.200	1.782	516	659	shut	.000	.600	stopped	.000	.000
1.000	14.400	2.060	240	379	shut	.000	.600	stopped	.000	.000
1.500	21.600	2.328	.028	106	shut	.000	.600	stopped	.000	.000
2.000	28.800	2.584	.284	.156	shut	.000	.600	stopped	.000	.000
2.500	36.000	2.823	.523	.403	shut	.000	.600	stopped	.000	.000
3.000	43.200	3.040	.740	.631	open	.246	.604	flowing	.557	2.452
3.500	50.000	3.234	.934	.837	open	.670	.616	flowing	1.517.	6.675
4.000	57.600	3.400	1.100	1.017	open	.879	.632	flowing	1.990	8.758
4.500	64.800	3.536	1.236	1.168	open	1.017	.651	flowing	2.302	10.130
5.000	72.000	3.640	1.340	1.288	open	1.110	.651	flowing	2.512	11.051
5.500	79.200	3.710	1.410	1.375	open	1.167	.692	flowing	2.641	11.619
6.000	86.400	3.746	1.446	1.428	open	1.193	.713	flowing	2.700	11.878
6.500	93.600	3.746	1.446	1.446	open	1.190	.734	flowing	2.693	11.848
7.000	100.800	3.710	1.410	1.428	open	1.157	.755	flowing	2.620	11.527
7.500	108.000	3.640	1.340	1.375	open	1.094	.775	flowing	2.477	10.898
8.000	115.200	3.536	1.236	1.288	open	.995	.793	flowing	2.253	9.914

Note:

TC (column 3) stands for tidal level on local hydrographic datum.

PB (column 4) Equivalent tidal level, at the outside of the sluice gate, on land survey datum.

Intl. level (column 8) Internal pond/supply channel level on land survey datum.

PB (column 4)

TC - 2.3m, the difference between the two datum standards. This is then related to the internal level to determine whether the gate should be shut (if outside level lower than inside) or open (the converse), and if open, what water velocity would result from the difference in levels from the outside to the inside of the sluice. The water velocity over the time period, multiplied by the effective sluice cross sectional area, gives the incremental volume delivered to the pond system over the period.

(Hrs.) (m) (rn) <b>PB</b> (rn) position (m3/sec) lvl status (m/s	length
1.000 14.400 2.060 .240 .379 shut .000 .980 stopped .	.000
1.500 21.600 2.328 .028 .106 shut .000 .980 stopped .	.000
2.000 28.800 2.584 .284 .156 shut .000 .980 stopped .	.000
2.500 36.000 2.823 .523 .403 shut .000 .980 stopped .	.000
•	.000
3.500 50.400 3.234 .934 .837 shut .000 .980 stopped .	.000
4.000 57.600 3.400 1.100 1.017 open .266 .985 flowing .	503 2.652
4.500 64.800 3.536 1.236 1.168 open .595 .995 flowing 1.	346 <b>5.922</b>
,	701 7.485
5.500 79.200 3.710 1.410 1.375 open .841 1.024 overflow 1.	903 8.375
	999 8.796
•	004 8.815
	919 8.442
•	734 7.630
1	417 6.235
•	3.702
	000 .000
••	.000 .000
	.000
5.000 72.000 3.640 1.340 1.288 open .921 .865 flowing 2.0	9.174
•	246 9.884
6.000 86.400 3.746 1.446 1.428 open 1.026 .902 flowing 2.	322 10.217
6.500 93.600 3.746 1.446 1.446 open 1.025 .920 flowing 2.	320 10.210
7.000 100.800 3.710 1.410 1.428 open .990 .938 flowing 2.	242 9.865
7.500 108.000 3.640 1.340 1.375 open .919 .954 flowing 2.	080 9.153
8.000 115.200 3.536 1.236 1.288 open .803 .969 flowing 1.	817 7.994
	403 6.174
•	502 2.650
•	.000
10.000 144.000 2.823 .523 .631 shut .000 .985 stopped .	.000 .000
***	.000
**	.000
	.000 .000
••	.000
••	.000
.000 .000 1.500 .800 .000 .980 .	.000
.500 7.200 1.782 .518 .659 shut .000 980 stopped	.000
8.500 122.400 3.400 1.100 1.168 open .851 .808 flowing 1.	926 8.476
9.000 129.600 3.234 .934 1.017 open .635 .820 flowing 1.	436 6.320
9.500 136.800 3.040 .740 .837 open .183 .823 flowing .	413 1.819
•	.000
•	.000
•	.000
•	.000 .000
	.000 .000
••	.000

Time (Hrs.)	Degrees	TC (m)	PB (m)	Mean IvI PB (m)	Sluice position	Flow rate (m³/sec)	Intl lvi (m)	Flow status	Velocity (m/sec)	Protection length
.000	.000	1.500	.800			.000	.820		.000	.000
.500	7.200	1.782	.518	.659	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
1.000	14.400	2.060	.240	.379	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
1.500	21.600	2.328	.028	.106	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
2.000	28.800	2.584	.284	.156	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
2.500	36.000	2.823	.523	.403	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
3.000	43.200	3.040	.740	.631	shut	.000	.820	stopped	.000	.000
3.500	50.400	3.234	.934	.837	open	.181	.823	flowing	.410	1.802
4.000	57.600	3.400	1.100	1.017	open	.611	.834	flowing	1.384	6.089
4.500	64.80	3.536	1.236	1.168	open	.803	.849	flowing	1.817	7.995
10.500	151.200	2.584	.284	.403	shut	.000	1.103	stopped	.000	.000
11.000	158.400	2.328	.028	.156	shut	.000	1.103	stopped	.000	.000
11.500	165.600	2.060	.240	.106	shut	000	1.103	stopped	.000	.000
12.000	172.800	1.782	.518	.379	shut	.000	1.103	stopped	.000	.000
12.500	180.00	1.500	.800	.659	shut	000	1.103	stopped	.000	.000

### COST OUTLINE: SLUICES

**Option A** Seasonal cutting/refilling

Note This provides for the use of a very simple low-cost structure during the dry

season. The bund can be filled partially during the wet season, or completely filled during peak flooding time. The main disadvantages of this system are the lack of effective means of flow and level control, the difficulty of providing water exchange during periods when the wall is rebuilt to protect

against flood waters.

Costs : Where width = 1.5m, CSA =  $16 m^2$ , allowing  $6 Rs/m^3$  to include

additional costs of loosening and reconsolidating soil, cost for 2 cycles of

cutting/refilling per year is

2x2x1.5x16 = 576Rs/yr

Option B Simple tar or oil barrel sluice

Note This is a semi-permanent sluice, with an estimated lifespan of 5 years, if

adequately protected. The system is costed with two alternative level control devices, both set internally. A sluice length of 7 metres is assumed.

Costs : Main Sluice: Earthworks, allow 250 Rs. 7 barrels @ 100 Rs, welding, allow

150 Rs. tar coating, allow 200 Rs, bamboo piling/fixing

(allow 5 lengths) 150 Rs.

Total = 1450 Rs.

Sluice (a) Wooden Box, 6 m x I m x | m, 20 mm thick, @ 4000

Control Rs/ $m^3$  = 1120 Rs, plus labour, 2 man-days @ 20 Rs = 40 Rs, nails, etc.

10 Rs, tar 50 Rs, broken brick/bamboo foundation, allow 100 Rs.

Total = 1320 Rs.

(b) Brick, approx 18 m<sup>2</sup>. of single course construction, allow 50 bricks/m<sup>2</sup> 900 bricks @ 1200 Rs. 1000 = 1080 Rs, mortar, allow 200 Rs, broken brick concrete/bamboo pile foundation, allow 300 Rs, labour 4 man-days @ 20 Rs = 80 Rs.

Total = 1660 Rs.

Thus annualised costs, assuming a 5-year life, net of financing charges, etc., is

Sluice with wooden control structure: **554** Rs/yr Sluice with brick control structure : 622 **Rs/yr** 

Option C Simple 'bamboo cement' sluice

Note: This is more experimental in concept than other designs using bamboo matting

and woven strips as the tensile components in the structure, with mortar/concrete as the compressive element. As the bamboo is not very strong, and as it may deteriorate relatively quickly in these conditions, a life span of 3 years is assumed. As the control structure may last longer than this, it may be feasible either to repair the pipe section or to construct a lower-specification control section.

Costs : Bamboo mesh area,  $7 \text{ m x } 0.75 \text{ m dia x 2 layers} = 32 \text{ m}^2 @ 4 \text{ Rs/m}^2 \text{ is } 128$ 

Rs. Allow 12 poles for bracing and piling @ 30 Rs = 360 Rs. Mortar at 3 mm

thicknessxl6 m<sup>2</sup> xI.5t/m<sup>3</sup> = 720kg; 120 kgcement, 215 Rs, 600 kgsand, 80 Rs, total mortar 295 Rs. Earthworks, **allow** 250 Rs, labour allow 3 days @ 20 Rs, 60 Rs.

Total = 1093 Rs.

Thus annualised costs, including water control structure with 3- year life, would be

Sluice with wooden control structure: 840 Rs/yr Sluice with brick control structure: 918 Rs/yr

Option D Concrete 'hume' pipe

Note This would be the conventional form of construction. It is assumed that a

properly constructed pipe would have a life of 10 years.

Costs

Materials: 3 pipes 1000 Rs and 2 collars @ 150 Rs, 2.5 ft size, total 3300 Rs. Piling and fixing, including concrete support for collars; allow 1000 Rs.

Earthworks, 250 Rs, labour, allow 6 man-days @ 20 Rs = 120 Rs.

**Total** = 4670 Rs.

Annualised costs, allowing 1320 Rs to replace wooden control box, and 1000

Rs to repair brick box

Sluice with wooden control structure: 731 Rs/yr Sluice with brick control structure: 733 Rs/yr

Option E Wooden sluice box

Note This would use a tarred wood box structure, similar to that of the proposed

water control structure, with slightly heavier timbers. Assumed lifespan is

5 vears.

Costs Dimensions 7 m x 0.8 m x 0.8 m by 25 cm thick =  $0.56 \text{ m}^3$  allow 0.7 m<sup>3</sup>

to include bracing timber, @ 4500/m³ 3150 Rs, plus labour, 4 man-days,

80 Rs, earthworks 250 Rs, piling/fixing, 150 Rs, tar 200 Rs.

**Total** = 3830 Rs.

**Annualised costs** 

Sluice with wooden control structure 1030 Rs/yr Sluice with brick control structure : 1098 Rs/yr

COST OUTLINE: PROTECTIVE WORKS

On a typical exterior sluice, a floor area of approximately 15  $m^2$  on each side, plus (minimum) 10  $m^2$  each side of external wing area and 5  $m^2$  internal wing area would be required to protect the sluice and its works from scouring. The options would be as follows

Option A : Single-skin brick

Note : A layer of brick edge on is used, with mortar jointing, laid over a shallow

broken-brick base for the apron areas. For wall protection, reinforcing

buttresses are provided.

Costs : Allow 60 m<sup>2</sup> @ 50 bricks/m<sup>2</sup>. plus 30% to provide foundations, abutments,

etc., @ 1200 Rs/1000, 4680 Rs. Allow 600 Rs for mortar, 16 man-days labour,

320 Rs, allow 400 Rs for foundations.

Total = 6000 Rs.

Option B : Bamboo facing, brick apron

Note The apron area is constructed as option A, the walls and facing being made

from woven split bamboo poles, with matting reinforcement, tied and pinned

back into the dike.

Costs : Allow 3000 Rs. (pro-rata for area covered) fof apron, allow 1 pole/in<sup>2</sup> x 30

 $m^4 = 900$  Rs, plus 6 man-days for fixing, tying, 120 Rs, plus 100 Rs for

miscellaneous materials.

Total = 4120 Rs.

Option C Bamboo facing and apron

Note : Facing section as option B, apron made for a higher density split bamboo,

over brick rubble foundation.

Costs Allow 1120 Rc for facings (as option B). Bamboo, fixing, etc. for apron,

allow double : 2240 Rs, plus brick rubble, 30 m<sup>2</sup> x 0.2 m = 6 m<sup>3</sup> 360 Rs.

**Total** = 3720 **Rs.** 

Option D Light bamboo/matting

Note A lighter-grade construction could be made for limited lifespan use, by fixing

single or double layers of bamboo mat on the more exposed surfaces. A

lifespan of perhaps 1 to 2 years might be feasible.

Costs At 4 Rs/m<sup>2</sup> with double-layer matting, 480 Rs, plus materials bamboo for

pinning in matting, allow 100 Rs, plus labour, 6 man-days, 120 Rs.

Total = 700 Rs.

#### COST OUTLINE: SILVIPISCICULTURE PROJECT

Note Based on 40 ha unit, with 10 ha water area.

Construction cost:

Wall volumes Main dike, say 500 x 800 m, 2.5 m high, 1.5 m crown, allow 12 m³/metre

length, @ average  $31,200 \text{ m}^3$  at  $5 \text{ Rs/m}^3 = 156,000 \text{ Rs}$ , plus ground

clearance, topsoil, etc.,  $31,200 \text{ m}^2$  @ 1.8 Rs/: $\text{m}^2 = 56,160 \text{ Rs}$ .

Total = 212,160 **Rs.** 

Sluice Allow the amortised cost of cut and fill as base cost, with two sluices,

1 metre width, at 6 Rs/m<sup>3</sup> cut and fill, two cycles per year, 10% r,

cost is = 5,760 Rs.

Earthworks  $30,000 \text{ m}^3$  of the dike volume is taken from the inside of the site, and the

pond area is excavated to an average 0.7 m,  $70,000 \text{ m}^3$  of earth is produced, with net surplus of  $40,000 \text{ m}^3$ . If this is used for ridges, etc., at  $5 \text{ Rs/m}^3$  cut

and place, cost = 200,000 Rs.

With a typical ridge cross-section of 2.5 m<sup>2</sup>. this provides 16,000 m of ridging. Allowing 4,000 m<sup>3</sup> for internal dividing walls, this provides 60 x 240

m ridges, or 30 x 480 m ridges.

If the system were designed for the minimal amount of earth movement, with the most efficient excavation and construction, with, say a main pond area which could be filled to a greater depth and shallow side channels, a total volume of say 40,000 m<sup>3</sup> could be used, leaving 10,000 m<sup>3</sup> for internal ridges, dividing walls, etc. At a reduced cost of 4 Rs/m<sup>3</sup> minimum cost of

internal earthworks = 40,000 Rs.

Miscellaneous Allowance for survey, materials, huts, etc. = 25,000 Rs.

Returns Fish/shellfish production, based on recorded yields, with surplus 20% for

actual market prices as prices recorded are 'ex-farm gate' = 45,600 Rs.

Incidental returns, wood, grazing, etc. allow 400 Rs/ha, on 30 ha of land

area = 12,000 Rs.

Total Returns = 57,600 Rs.

#### Summary of costs and returns:

Overall capital costs, assuming average 0.7 m

excavation in pond areas = 442,920 Rs.

(approx. 11,100 **Rs/ha**)

In optimal conditions, with restricted excavation

volumes, etc. cost could be reduced to = 282,920 Rs.

(approx. 7,100 Rs/ha)

With only three wall sides (eg. if there were common walls with other plots), cost could be further reduced, perhaps to 200,000 Rs. or 5,000 **Rs/ha** 

On a simply amortised basis, the annualised cost of the system would be about 28,300 · 44,300 Rs/yr

Costs of casual labour, maintenance, etc.,

at I,000 man-days work/yr = **20,000 Rs/yr**Revenue from products, etc. = 57,600 **Rs/yr** 

Gross returns = (6,700) - 9,300 Rs/yr