v4.0

HYDROLOGY REVIEW

The latest version of the Flood Estimation guidlines is : LIT 11832 (available

Project :	Land at North West Bicester	**Job Number :**	

Competence level of analyst who carried out study :	Level 1 – Hydrologist with minimum approved experience in flood estimation	**Complexity of study :**	Routine
Revision	1		
Area Lead			

	1st review	2nd review	3rd review
Date			
Reviewer			

PURPOSE OF THE HYDROLOGICAL STUDY and any particular concerns or as

Hydrological study required to supporty the moddeling of the Land at North West Bicester. Ca
of review should focus on these elements.

SUMMARY - IS THE HYDROLOGY FIT FOR PURPOSE?

Several queries need to be addressed before the hydrology can be marked fit for purpose. Prir
donors, these are non standard methods.

MODEL REVIEW PROCESS

Hydrology report and model reviews are an essential component of the Hydrology Quality Assurance (
Hydrology calculations and that they are suitable for the intended purpose. Evidence that the Hydrolog
external parties and hence all reviews should be written with an expectation that they could be read ex

Should any issue(s) be raised during the review process, which require attention, the reviewer should
to allow the Hydrologist to complete the changes as appropriate. Completion of this Hydrology Review
Hydrology calculation approval. Once the suggested changes have been completed, the reviewer may
resubmitted for further review to establish whether the actions have been completed satisfactorily. On
completed satisfactorily, will the model be approved and the quality assured by the reviewer.

It is recommended that the reviewer makes good use of the fluvial design guide chapter 2

http://evidence.environment-agency.gov.uk/FCERM/en/FluvialDesignGuide/Chapter2.aspx?pagenum

Depending on the work being reviewed some questions or entire sections may not be relevant, in whic
completion of the review the reviewer may choose to use the following colour coding system to alert th
(if any).

Comments should be colour coded using the RAG (red, amber, green) Status shown at the top of the

Colour coding used:

OK – Good practice.
Minimum response: No minimum.
Maximum expected response: No maximum.
Planning: No Objection.

Green – Consider for future studies. Negligible impact on the results that is unlikely to change the ou
Minimum response: Acknowledge the comment in the spreadsheet and update the limitation section c
Maximum expected response: Actions done to address the issue identified.
Planning: No Objection.

Note: Taking action to address issues would be expected and some issues may be addressed coincic

Amber – Follow recommendation. Potential impact on the results that may change the outcome of th
Minimum response: Comments justifying the approach taken and update the limitation section of the r
Maximum expected response: Actions done to address the issue identified.
Planning: Consider objecting to the application based on comments highlighted in this category.

Note: Taking action to address issues should be undertaken, some issues may be addressed coincide

Red – Must do. Has an impact on the results that may have a significant impact on the outcome of th
Minimum response: Comments thoroughly justifying approach from applicant based on evidence and
sorted.
Maximum expected response: Actions done to address the issue identified.
Planning: Objection - Application to be objected if comments are highlighted in this category.
Note: If no action is taken the response must clearly demonstrate why the issue raised is not relevant
up with evidences. If issues highlighted red are ignored, then submissions should always be sent back

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWING FLOOD ESTIMATES

This checklist is taken from a supporting document to the Environment Agency's Flood Estimation Gu
their own work (both internal staff and consultants working for us), supervisors carrying out internal re
calculations. The list can be filled in to create a record of the review. Rather than attempting to cover
would make the list rather long and unwieldy, it concentrates on common pitfalls. Some of the most c
highlighted. Reviewers are assumed to be familiar with the Flood Estimation Guidelines and compete

The structure of the checklist generally follows that of the calculation record, starting with the method
the results.

The answer to most of the questions should be "Yes". It is not always the appropriate answer, though
quick and approximate answer would not normally include a historic review or a lengthy calculation of
data. Evaluation should be appropriate to the level of detail and risk of the study. Before reviewing st
Agency, check the brief and ask the project manager what has been agreed with them.

ıt

in Content Cloud)

4th review

pects that need review.

tchment is permeable and ungauged, focus

nary comments relate to the use of QMED

(QA) process that provides confidence in
ıy has undergone QA may be requested by
‹ternally.

detail the action(s) required in sufficient detail
/ document does not automatically constitute
/ require that the Hydrology calculation be
ly once all the amendments have been

=9

ch case they can be marked 'not applicable'. On
ıe modeller to the priority of the actions required

page i.e.

ıtcome of the study.
›f the report.

lentally by work on others.

ıe study.
eport if not sorted.

entally by work on others.

ıe study.
update the limitation section of the report if not

and the approach employed is justified backed
‹.

idelines. It can be used by analysts checking
views or staff reviewing consultants'
every aspect of a flood estimation study, which
ommon or severe errors or omissions are
nt to judge what choices are appropriate.

statement and ending with the presentation of

. For example, lower risk studies needing a
ReFH model parameters from flow and rainfall
udies carried out on behalf of the Environment

Green

Amber
Red
OK
N/A