### Laboratory Analysis of Stormwater Control Measure Mass Load Capacity and Long-Term Performance

Ocean Protect Webinar- Craig Fairbaugh - 7/28/22











### Background

Stormwater: only major source of surface water pollution that is increasing in the U.S<sup>1</sup>

Stormwater Control Measures (SCM)

- Bioretention (BRT)
- High Rate Biofiltration (HRBF)



Midwest bioretention cell<sup>2</sup>.





Expiration Date: January 30, 2016 Permit Number: 101314 File Number: 108015

# Background

#### Numeric reduction targets

80% Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removal

#### Performance Verification

- Public domain devices academic research based
- Manufactured Treatment Devices (MTDs)
  - Testing protocols
  - ▶ WA Dept Ecology TAPE<sup>4</sup> field
  - ► NJ DEP<sup>5</sup> lab

#### STEPP<sup>6</sup>

 ASTM Committee E64 on Stormwater Control Measures<sup>7</sup> NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4) DISCHARGE PERMIT

> Oregon Department of Environmental Quality 811 SW Sixth Ave., Portland OR 97204-1390 Telephone: 503-229-5630

Issued pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute 468B.050 and the Federal Clean Water Act

ISSUED TO: City of Portland Port of Portland SOURCES COVERED BY THIS PERMIT:

This permit covers all existing and new discharges of stormwater from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) within the City of Portland Urban Services Boundary.

COUNTY: Multnomah

RECEIVING WATERBODIES: Basin(s): Willamette River, Columbia River Sub-basin(s): Lower Willamette River, Columbia Slough, Tualatin River

City of Portland Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Permit (MS4)<sup>3</sup>.



http://nationalstormwateralliance.org/stepp/





### Background

- Q: What about achieving pollutant reduction over time?
- A: maintenance
- Q: How do we enforce and test systems for maintenance?



Bioretention system with clogged media and standing water<sup>8</sup>.





# Background

- NJDEP sediment loading protocol
  - Allen et al., 2020: TAPE vs NJDEP
- Need additives to better represent constituents in real stormwater?

	Approved Hydraulic Loading Rate	
Technology Namo	TAPE Basic	NJDEP 80 % TSS
recimology Name	Treatment	Removal
	GULD	Certification
BayFilter Enhanced Media Cartridge	0.5	0.5
Kraken Stormwater Filtration System	0.05	0.05
PerkFilter Media Filtration System	1.5	2.54
Up-Flo Filter with 285R Filter Ribbon Media	0.8	1.26
BioPod Biofilter with StormMix Media	1.6	1.8
Filterra Bioretention System	1.82	1.45
Filterra HC	-	3.11

Comparison of certified hydraulic loading rates for filtration manufactured treatment devices9









# Objective

Determine the effects that synthetic stormwater made from silica, organics and motor oil have on SCM mass load capacity versus just silica sediment alone.



City of Portland bioretention planter<sup>11</sup>.

High rate biofilter, Bellingham, WA<sup>12</sup>.





#### HRBF experimental setup

- 2014 Contech Filterra NJDEP report<sup>13</sup> as baseline
- Engineered media from Contech
- 21" engineered media, 4" stone, 3" mulch
- Hydraulic loading rate = 140"/hr (1.56 gpm/ft<sup>2</sup>)
- 9" design ponding depth above media surface







#### HRBF experimental setup

- Peristaltic pumps
- Slurry tank w/pump (sediment mixing)
  - 2 mixers
  - Recirculation pump
- Source water tank w/pump
- Oil trials = oil pump
- Influent: Seametrics flow meter + data logger
- Effluent: timed bucket







#### BRT experimental setup

- COP SW-231 (Presumptive Approach)<sup>14</sup>
- 24" media, 10" stone
  - 60/40 Sand-compost
  - Raised outlet 4" IWS
- 3" mulch (not required by COP)
- 6"/hr media rate (0.06 gpm/sf)
- 12" design ponding depth above media surface
- Santa Barbara Urban Hydrograph (SBUH) runoff method and HydroCAD model
- Drainage area = 840 sf





SW-231 planter design (BES, 2020).



BRT column design hydrograph utilizing media exfiltration rate of 6"/hr (constant velocity).

![](_page_8_Picture_16.jpeg)

# BRT experimental setup

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_4.jpeg)

Bioretention stone and 1st lift of media.

![](_page_9_Picture_6.jpeg)

Bioretention media and mulch installed.

![](_page_9_Picture_8.jpeg)

Bioretention experimental test setup.

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

BRT media sourcing: COP Stormwater Facility Blended Soil Vendor & Hauler List<sup>15</sup>

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

August 2021

![](_page_10_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

December 2021

![](_page_10_Picture_7.jpeg)

# Methods: NJDEP Filter Protocol<sup>16</sup>

#### **Removal Efficiency trials**

#### 10 trials at MTFR

- "maximum treatment flow rate"
- Influent TSS = 180-220 mg/L
  - ► COV ≤ 0.10
- Effluent TSS: grab sample
  - Min 5 effluent samples per trial
  - ► 500 mL minimum
- 80% TSS removal efficiency
- Known influent volume
- Known influent mass

#### **Sediment Loading trials**

- Conduct trials until "failure"
  - Sediment mass loading vs RE
  - Sediment mass loading vs head loss at MTFR
  - Sediment mass loading vs effluent flow rate
- Influent TSS = 360-440 mg/L
  - ► COV ≤ 0.10
- Effluent TSS: grab sample
  - ▶ 3 effluent samples per trial
  - ▶ 500 mL minimum
- Known influent volume
- Known influent mass

![](_page_11_Picture_24.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_25.jpeg)

#### NJDEP test sediment spec

- "hard, firm, inorganic"
- Specific gravity = 2.65
- Uniformly distributed
- 🕨 d50 = 75 μm
- ▶ d20 = 8 µm

#### AGSCO test sediment

- Inorganic silica
- ▶ d50 = 60 µm

▶ d20 = 9 µm

![](_page_12_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_13.jpeg)

#### Organic test sediment concentration

- Median TVSS:SSC
  - Average = 30.8%
  - SSC more representative of ASTM D3970 (vs TSS)
- Target = 70% silica:30% compost

#### Organic test sediment source:

#### Cedar Grove compost<sup>18</sup>

- Ecology certified, etc.
- 55.9% organic matter by weight
- ~30% compost -> ~15% organic content
- Cap compost at 30% to try and retain NJDEP PSD

Portland State

![](_page_13_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_13.jpeg)

Cedar Grove compost specification (2018).

#### Organic test sediment: Standard of Practice (SOP)

- Wet sieve < 1000 µm</p>
- > 24 hr settling period
- Decant aqueous volume
- Rinse sludge with DI
- Dry for 24-48 hrs @ 100°C
- ► Weigh sample until ∆ mass < 0.1 g

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

Sieved compost test sediment and rinse water.

![](_page_14_Picture_10.jpeg)

Sieved compost solids after decanting rinse water.

![](_page_14_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_15.jpeg)

- How does organic matter affect PSD?
- Hydrometer sieve method

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Hydrocarbon concentration

- National Stormwater Quality Database<sup>18:</sup> Sites <20 acres</p>
- Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH)
  - Mean = 5.6 mg/L; Median = 5.7 mg/L
- Oil & Grease
  - Mean = 7.1 mg/L; Median = 5.3 mg/L
- Target concentration = 7 mg/L

#### Hydrocarbon source

- Shell 5W-30 motor oil
  - ► SG = 0.88 (60°F)

![](_page_16_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_13.jpeg)

### HRBF-1: Inorganic

#### ▶ 69 trials

- 9" ponding @ trial 69
- 16,650 gal treated
- 63.1 lbs treated
  - ▶ 22.9 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Avg Inf TSS = 478.8 mg/L
- Avg TSS RE = 77.2%
- Differences vs 2014 Filterra?
  - ► Higher influent TSS
  - Auger vs slurry tank

Portland State

![](_page_17_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

- ► 13 trials
- 9" ponding @ trial 13
- 2,202 gal treated
- 5.3 lbs treated
  - ▶ 1.9 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Avg Inf TSS = 426.3 mg/L
  - 23% compost
  - ► 3<sup>rd</sup> party lab: 17% TVSS:TSS
- Avg TSS RE = 90.3%
- Oil loading = 22.9 g/ft<sup>2</sup>

![](_page_18_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_14.jpeg)

<u>HRBF-1 Inorganic vs</u>

#### <u>HRBF-2</u> Inorganic/Organic/Oil

- Both trials concluded @
  9" bypass
- 22.9 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup> vs 1.9 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Adding oil and organics decreased mass capacity

![](_page_19_Figure_6.jpeg)

ENGINEERED SOLUTIONS

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### BRT-1 Inorganic

- 117 trials
- No failure
  - Approx 30% PDX annual rainfall
  - ► Max ponding = 3"
- 6,479 gal treated
- 24.0 lbs treated
  - 1.8 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Avg Inf TSS = 427.8 mg/L
- Avg TSS RE = 97.9%

![](_page_20_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_13.jpeg)

#### <u>BRT-2</u> Inorganic/Organic/oil

- 31 trials
- <90% Effluent MTFR</p>
- <80% TSS Removal</p>
  - Compost flushing
- 1,508 gal treated
- 5.2 lbs treated
  - ▶ 0.39 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Avg Inf TSS = 453 mg/L
- Avg TSS RE = 80.6%
- Oil loading = 2.99 g/ft<sup>2</sup>

![](_page_21_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_15.jpeg)

<u>BRT-2</u> Inorganic/Organic/Oil

- 31 trials
- <90% Effluent flow rate failure
- <80% TSS Removal</p>
  - Compost flushing
- 1,508 gal treated
- 5.2 lbs treated
  - ▶ 0.39 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- Avg Inf TSS = 449 mg/L
- ► TSS RE = 80.6%
- Oil loading = 2.99 g/ft<sup>2</sup>

![](_page_22_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_14.jpeg)

### BRT-1 Inorganic vs

#### BRT-2 Inorganic/Organic/Oil

- No bypass
- BRT-1 headloss
  - ▶ 3" ponding @ 1.8 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- BRT-2 headloss
  - 3" ponding @ 0.37 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup>
- BRT-2 max ponding > BRT-1 max ponding
- Adding oil and organics decreased mass capacity

Portland State

![](_page_23_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_11.jpeg)

# **Results:** Flushing

- BRT-1 lowest V
- HRBF-2 & BRT-1
  - ▶ ≥90% TSS RE
- HRBF low turbidity
- BRT-2 QA/QC
  - 7 lbs TSS leached?

![](_page_24_Picture_7.jpeg)

BRT-2 flushing samples 3 and 4.

![](_page_24_Picture_9.jpeg)

System	Flushing volume (gal)	Turbidity (NTU)	Media Volume (cf)	Flushing Volume per Media Volume (gal/cf)
HRBF-1	249.82	13.5	4.83	51.7
HRBF-2	220.43	9.92	4.83	45.6
BRT-1	999.57	17.8	22.93	43.6
BRT-2	2000	254	22.93	87.2

BRT and HRBF flushing volume and turbidity results.

BRT-2 Flushing Sample	Flushing Volume (gal)	TSS (mg/L)	Estimated Cumulative Flushing Load (lbs)
1	0	702	-
2	1000	490	4.97
3	1608	161	1.65
4	1951	89	0.36

![](_page_24_Figure_13.jpeg)

BRT-2 TSS vs flushing volume.

![](_page_24_Picture_15.jpeg)

BRT-2 flushing volume TSS results.

# Results: Additional discussion

- ▶ BRT-1 & BRT-2 discolored effluent
- Bioretention phosphorus leaching
  - Ecology 2013<sup>19</sup>
  - Ecology 2021<sup>20</sup>
  - ► BMP database<sup>21,22</sup>
- Effluent total P
  - Min = 0.892 mg/L
  - Max = 3.80 mg/L
  - Mean DP:TP = 84%
- ► TAPE TP influent = 0.1-0.5 mg/L
  - ▶ 50% total P removal
  - TP effluent = 0.05-0.25 mg/L
- BRT column P leaching: orders of magnitude higher than TAPE effluent values

![](_page_25_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_16.jpeg)

### Healthy Plants = Water Quality?

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Engineered media = Water Quality

### **EWRI Stormwater Media Filtration Committee**

![](_page_26_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_6.jpeg)

### Conclusions

- Mass load capacity is <u>lower</u> when adding organics and oil to silica test sediment
  - NJDEP filter protocol laboratory results likely overestimate mass capacity
- Annual mass retained and typical maintenance intervals need more data
- BRT media stability is variable and demonstrated significant leaching of solids and nutrients
  - Better media QAQC likely to improve removal efficiency and loading results
- Alternative media specifications with less compost can reduce nutrient export

Portland St

# Next Steps?

- Standard methods needed for including organic test sediment and hydrocarbons to laboratory test sediment
  - ► ASTM E64 committee
- How do varying concentrations of organics and oil affect mass load capacity?
- Does accelerated lab testing of nonvegetated systems represent RE and mass load capacity of in-situ vegetated systems?
- BRT mass load capacity without mulch?
- Does typical maintenance restore system performance?

![](_page_27_Picture_14.jpeg)

### References

- 1. https://nationalstormwateralliance.org/
- 2. https://bluegrasslawn.com/msd-bio-retentio
- 3. https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bes/37485
- 4. https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Guidance-technical-assistance/Stormwater-permittee-guidance-resources/Emerging-stormwater-treatment-technologies
- 5. https://www.nj.gov/dep/stormwater/ treatment.html#:-:text=Stormwater%20Manufac tured%20Treatment%20Devices, the%20requirements%20for%20major%20development.
- 6. http://nationalstormwateralliance.org/stepp/
- 7. https://www.astm.org/get-involved/technical-committees/committee-e64/subcommittee-e64
- 8. https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=File:Failing\_BMP\_1.jpg
- 9. Allen, V.; Berg, D.; Fairbaugh, C.; 2020. "Improving post-construction stormwater management program results through incorporation of performance verification standards for stormwater control measures." WEFTEC 2020 Conference proceedings.
- 10. https://www.neponset.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/oil-runoff-into-storm-drain-e1440173641920.jpg2020
- 11. https://www.urbangardensweb.com/2009/11/01/growing-green-streets-to-go-with-the-flow/portland-green-streets-5/
- 12. http://www.njcat.org/uploads/newDocs/FilterraVerificationReportFinal.pdf
- 13. http://www.njcat.org/uploads/newDocs/FilterraVerificationReportFinal.pdf
- 14. https://www.portland.gov/bes/stormwater/swmm
- 15. https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bes/article/582089
- 16. https://www.nj.gov/dep/stormwater/pdf/Filter\_Protocol\_Final\_2022\_01\_14.pdf
- 17. https://cedar-grove.com/docs/Organic\_compost\_quarterly\_10-15-2018\_QA.pdf
- 18. https://bmpdatabase.org/national-stormwater-quality-database
- 19. https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1310017.html
- 20. https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/documents/2110023.pdf
- 21. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f8dbde10268ab224c895ad7/t/5fbd3c237ad3fe66120f69ea/1606237239545/2016\_BMPDBSummaryStatistics\_03-SW-1COh.pdf
- 22. https://www.waterrf.org/resource/international-stormwater-bmp-database-2020-summary-statistics

![](_page_28_Picture_23.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_24.jpeg)

### Thank you! <u>Craig.Fairbaugh@ContechES.com</u>

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

<u>https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.</u> edu/open\_access\_etds/5926/

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)