Interactive comment on "Partitioning spatial and temporal rainfall variability in urban drainage modelling" *by* Nadav Peleg et al.

S. Ochoa Rodriguez (Referee)

s.ochoa-rodriguez@imperial.ac.uk

Received and published: 13 December 2016

Review - Partitioning spatial and temporal rainfall variability in urban drainage modelling

by Susana Ochoa-Rodriguez & Li-Pen Wang

This study explores the influence of the spatial and natural climatological variability of rainfall on rainfall and associated flow return period estimation in urban areas. For this purpose, a stochastic rainfall generator was employed to generate rainfall time series with and without spatial variability. The resulting rainfall time series (corresponding to 4 different scenarios including combinations of spatial and climatological rainfall variability) were applied as input to the urban drainage model of a test catchment in Lucerne, Switzerland. Based on the results, both rainfall and flow return periods were computed and the individual influence of spatial and climatological rainfall variability on extremes

was quantified.

The study is very interesting and the results constitute a valuable contribution towards improved design of urban drainage systems. The paper is well written and we certainly enjoyed reading it.

I suggest that the authors clarify/address the following points prior to publication:

1. Please specify the drainage area of the points at which urban flows were analysed. As highlighted in previous studies (e.g. Berne et al. (2004); Gires et al. (2012); Wang et al. (2012); Ochoa-Rodriguez et al. (2015)), the drainage area of interest has a significant impact on the impact of spatial rainfall variability on simulated urban flows. In fact, in the figures provided in the supplement of the manuscript under consideration, it can be seen that the impact of spatial variability is somewhat different at the different locations at which flows are analysed. This is likely partly due to differences in the drainage areas associated to each point under consideration (this is, the areas upstream of the point of interest). Please provide information about the drainage areas under consideration and briefly analyse the impact of this factor on your results (a detailed analysis of this could also be suggested as 'future work').

2. While 2 km radar data were employed to calibrate the rainfall generator, 100 m spatial data were then generated. Please discuss the implications of this and whether the downscaling model that was employed accounts for scaling, thus making it appropriate to downscale down to 100 m (although the model was only calibrated based on 2km data).

3. The temporal resolution adopted in the study (10 min) may be too coarse for urban applications and may result in smoothing of urban flows, which may in turn result in underestimation of flow extremes (as indicated in Ochoa-Rodriguez et al. (2015), temporal resolutions <= 5 min are required for urban hydrological applications, with resolutions of 10 min leading to large underestimation of peak flows. Likewise, Wang et al. (2015) showed results of flow simulations resulting from rainfall inputs at tempo-

ral resolutions from 1 to 10 minutes and compared them against flow observations; the results associated to 10 min rainfall inputs largely underestimated observed flow peaks and resulted in 'distorted' hydrographs). I understand that the temporal resolution of choice was likely constrained by the resolution at which rain gauge rainfall records were available. Please discuss the implications and limitations of the temporal resolution of choice and clearly mention in the future work section that tests should be conducted at finer temporal resolutions.

4. The current title of the paper is rather misleading and I would suggest changing it to better reflect the purpose and focus of the study. For example, the focus on extreme values / return period should somehow be mentioned. Furthermore, I would suggest changing 'temporal variability' to 'natural climatological variability'. The term temporal variability conveys the idea of temporal resolution, which, as described above, is not the purpose of this study and is in fact one of its shortcomings.

REFERENCES:

Berne, A., Delrieu, G., Creutin, J.-D. & Obled, C. (2004). Temporal and spatial resolution of rainfall measurements required for urban hydrology. Journal of Hydrology, 299, 166-179.

Gires, A., Onof, C., Maksimović, Č., Schertzer, D., Tchiguirinskaia, I. & Simoes, N. (2012). Quantifying the impact of small scale unmeasured rainfall variability on urban runoff through multifractal downscaling: A case study. Journal of Hydrology, 442, 117-128.

Ochoa-Rodriguez, S., Wang, L.-P., Gires, A., Pina, R. D., Reinoso-Rondinel, R., Bruni, G., Ichiba, A., Gaitan, S., Cristiano, E., Assel, J. v., Kroll, S., Murlà-Tuyls, D., Tisserand, B., Schertzer, D., Tchiguirinskaia, I., Onof, C., Willems, P. & ten Veldhuis, M.-C. (2015). Impact of spatial and temporal resolution of rainfall inputs on urban hydrodynamic modelling outputs: A multi-catchment investigation. Journal of Hydrology, 531, 389-407.

Wang, L.-P., Ochoa-Rodríguez, S., Van Assel, J., Pina, R. D., Pessemier, M., Kroll, S., Willems, P. & Onof, C. (2015). Enhancement of radar rainfall estimates for urban hydrology through optical flow temporal interpolation and Bayesian gauge-based adjustment. Journal of Hydrology, 531, 408-426.

Wang, L.-P., Onof, C., Ochoa-Rodríguez, S., Simoes, N. E. & Maksimović, Č. (2012). On the propagation of rainfall bias and spatial variability through urban pluvial flood modelling. In 9th International Workshop on Precipitation in Urban Areas: Urban challenges in rainfall analysis, Saint Moritz, Switzerland.

—————————————————————