



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Experimental and numerical study on the design of a deposition basin outlet structure at a mountain debris cone” by B. Gems et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 October 2013

Generally speaking, the manuscript combines numerical and physical modelling in an excellent way.

Some comments:

Abstract: There are more possibilities to implement mitigation measures against flooding and sediment deposition available, not only at the fan apex (not head).

2.1. Catchment characteristics: hazard potential ...is mainly related to long-lasting, advective precipitation events This sentence is a statement without any argument. There is quite a huge amount of sediments available in the catchment, therefore the process

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



is rather transport limited than supply limited. Design discharge of 55 m³/s includes sediments or not (10% relates to bedload component)? The experiments were conducted with 55 m³/s water discharge. Please clarify. What's the transport capacity in the basin upstream?

4.1. Model set up: The method of Fehr (1987) only is based on surface sampling, not on taking samples of the bed layer. What's the total volume of sediment (basin, influx)? Isn't there a need to include grain sizes up to 1 cm? (d₉₀)

4.2. Results input rates to about 5% Why not 10%?

5.2. Applied method Some remarks are missing what's happening with the sediments around the confluence with the Inn.

Figures: A little bit confusing. Too small. Same perspective would be helpful (3 and 8, all in 4, all in 7)

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 3169, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

