

Interactive comment on “Sandbagging versus Sandbag Replacement Systems: Costs, Time, Helpers, Logistics” by L. Lankenau and B. Koppe

L. Lankenau and B. Koppe

lena.lankenau@hs-bremen.de

Received and published: 21 August 2019

Dear Referee #1, Thank you very much for your review. Your proposal to link the two publications nhess-2019-164 and nhess-2019-165 is gladly accepted. This could provide a more understandable introduction to the problem without the risk of repetition of passages. Concerning the hydraulic efficiency, we would like to add a summary paragraph on water heads and seepage rates realized in testing but would like to refer to the paper Massolle et al. 2018 for more information. Considering justification of values like costs of trucks and fuel we will add more information on e.g. calculated distances. We will review all positions for traceability. Furthermore, we will state clearly the meaning of terms in the tables like 'time logistics' etc. Additionally, we will explain the chosen numbers e.g. for the need of helpers for specific access conditions etc. In the conclu-

C1

sions, we will include a paragraph on investment costs for both, sandbag systems and SBRS, to complete the statements on the cost calculations. In addition, the cost effect of multiple use of SBRS will be discussed and the topic repair possibility of SBRS will be included in the paper. The Authors are grateful for naming the additional literature. The paper by Wibowo & Ward (2016) is based on the tests published by Pinkard et al. (2007), which is cited in the manuscript. Rappazzo & Aronica (2016) focus mainly on pre-installed SBRS, which are outside the scope of the investigations. In the final version we will check whether we can consider the named papers as well as others for a broader view on the topic.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-165>, 2019.

C2