Improving Water Quality with Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development

> Florida Stormwater Association Winter Conference 2019



Mark Ellard, PE, CFM, D.WRE, ENV SP December 4, 2019

Benefits of GI / LID



Focus on **stormwater** as a resource

Challenges of GI / LID

- Effective integration with traditional practices
- Lack of familiarity of local contractors
- Lack of familiarity by City / County engineers
- Lack of familiarity by regional permitting authorities
- Lack of experience with maintenance procedures
- Demonstrating benefit
- Incentivizing



Geosyntec^D consultants

Orange County LID Manual project:

LID Manual

- 7 LID practices
- Practices suitable for greenfield type urban development

LID concept plans comparison •

- Traditional vs. LID site design
- Comparison of costs and maintenance requirements

LID maintenance cost projections ٠

- Annual maintenance costs for each of the LID practices

- 10-year maintenance cost projections

- Stormwater master planning
 - Mostly closed basins/good soils













GI / LID Practices:

- Pervious pavement
- Bioretention Areas/ Bioswales
- Rain Gardens
- Planter Box
- Tree Box Filters
- Curb Cuts & Inverted Medians
- Stormwater Harvesting / Cisterns













Cost Impacts:

- Capital Costs
 - Reduced infrastructure (\downarrow)
 - Potentially smaller ponds (\downarrow)
 - More vegetation/plantings ([†])
 - Contractor certifications ([†])
- **Maintenance Costs**
 - Training/certifications for personnel ([↑])
 - Replace typical landscaping offset overall BMP maintenance area (↓)
 - Infiltration/media testing ([†])



Concept Plans Comparison

- Purpose
 - Show LID techniques can accommodate equivalent density/intensity development as traditional methods
 - Provide alternatives to structural stormwater facilities
 - Provide additional opportunities for infiltration
 - Illustrate that water quality, water quantity, and nutrient loading criteria can be met or exceeded using LID practices

• Project Site (29.09 acres): portion of Hamlin PD

- Commercial: Grocery store 54,000 sq. ft.
 - Bank (Outparcel) 4,500 sq. ft.
 - Retail 4,500 sq. ft.
- Residential: 168 MF units (7 buildings at 24 units/building)





Geosyntec[>]

consultants







Comparison Results

- The LID Concept provides the same commercial and residential sq. ft. and parking
- LID Utilizes 25.31 acres of the original 29.09 acres a reduction of 3.78 acres (13%).
- The LID concept plan meets or exceeds the Traditional concept plan in all stormwater

management criteria.

Table 1: Comparison of Traditional and LID Results					
Traditional	LID				
4.40 ac-ft	5.83 ac-ft				
17.7 ac-ft	11.7 ac-ft				
8.46 cfs	8.05 cfs				
95.95%	96.69%				
1.19 kg/yr	0.86 kg/yr				
	aditional and I Traditional 4.40 ac-ft 17.7 ac-ft 8.46 cfs 95.95% 1.19 kg/yr				

(1): Treatment Volume is controlled by the retention depth needed for nutrient removal
(2): Total Inflow volume for the 25yr/24hr (Orange) storm event to Ponds 100/100L and 200/200L
(3): Peak Discharge to Lk Hancock for the 25yr/24hr (Orange) storm event







Pay Item	LID Cost	Traditional Cost	LID Description	Traditional Description
Pavement	\$ 741,323.67	\$ 586,532.87	Pervious Pavement, Pervious Asphalt, and Pavers	Asphalt and Concrete Sidewalk
Bioretention Swale	\$ 645,387.05	\$ 290,941.07	Bioretention Swale	Landscaping
Raingarden	\$ 408,062.24	\$ 104,400.34	Raingarden	Landscaping
Planter Box	\$ 47,296.75	\$ 9,645.40	Planter Box	Landscaping
Tree Box Filter	\$ 128,730.00	\$ 6,307.27	Tree Box Filter	Landscaping
Curbing and Medians	\$ 86,326.45	\$ 86,886.83	Valley Gutter, Type D curb, and Pavement	Type D Curb and Pavement
Stormwater Harvesting	\$ 212,621.14	N/A	Stormwater Harvesting	
Primary Storm System	\$ 398,769.82	\$ 818,139.65	Two Dry Retention Ponds	Two Dry Retention Ponds and One Wet Detention Pond
Secondary Storm System	\$ 354,529.42	\$ 644,946.81	36-inch Pipe, Manhole, DBI C, 36-Inch MES	12-inch & 36-inch Pipe, DBI C, 36-Inch MES
Undeveloped Land	N/A	\$ 849,000.00		\$200k/acre multi-family; \$250k/ acre retail
Totals:	\$ 3,023,047	\$ 3,396,800		_
			~12% Costs Savings	



Maintenance Costs Projections

- Project maintenance costs for each of the LID practices:
 - frequency
 - inspection activity
 - maintenance activity
 - labor/equipment/materials
 - costs of similar traditional stormwater management activities
- Compare example project data
- Compare to national data



Geosyntec^D

consultant





<u> </u>	Design Pervious Pavement Area (sf): 20000 Area of the Design pervious pavement			at practice. The Size Factor in the table below is applied to this area to against the annual			al cost.	, cost,											
					C	osts per (Maintenance Occurrence (A	Costs for Perv	ious Pave	ment	1	0	l osts per	daintenance (osts for Conver Average)	itional Pav	ement	-	
Maintenance Activity	Projected Frequency ²	Inspection Activity ²	Maintenance Activity Description ²	Labor / Equipment / Materials Required	Labor Hours ³	Cost / Hr ⁺	Material Allowance ⁴	Total Cost Per Occurrence:	Base Annual Cost:	Size Factor ⁵	Adjusted ⁶ Annual Cost:	Labor Hours ³	Cost / Hr ⁴	Material Allowance ⁴	Total Cost Per Occurrence:	Annual Cost:	Size Factor ⁵	Adjusted [®] Annual Cost:	Notes
Monthly Trash and Debris Removal	Monthly (12 times a year)	Inspect area for trash and debri accumulations	Remove trash and debris from pavement area.	Laborer with brooms, dust pans, and garbage bags.	0.5	\$40	\$5	\$25	\$300	0.20	\$300	0.5	\$40	\$5	\$25	\$300	0.20	\$300	Considered similar "Trash / Litter Pick and Removal" wor
3 times per year (Two times per per with laspection, dlowance for om additional	Inspect pavement for ponding water	Monitor these areas to determine if surface inflitration rates have been compromised. If so, vacuum area wit street sweeper to reduce the risk of clogging.	Inspector to perform visual inspection.	0.25	\$60	\$0	\$15	\$45	0.05	\$45	N/A	N/A	NZA	N/A	NZA	N/A	N/A		
	inspect pavement for accumulated sediment	Remove accumulated sediment by vacuuming with street sweeper if necessary. Identify source of sedimen and repair area	Inspector to perform visual inspection.	0.25	\$60	. \$0	\$15	\$45	0.05	\$45	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NZA	N/A	N/A	The hours estimate each task assume to the tasks would oc part of regular maintenance at mu	
Restoration	occurrence after : major storm.)	Inspect outlets	Remove accumulated sediment from outlet and repair areas of erosion	Laborer with hand tools. Rubble rip ray or gravel to repair erosion area.	0.25	\$40	\$25	\$35	\$105	0.05	\$105	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	NZA	pervious / convention pavement areas.
	Inspect adjacent areas for erosion	Stabilize bare areas	Laborer with hand tools. Cover bare areas with sod or gravel as needed.	0.25	\$40	\$25	\$35	\$105	0.10	\$105	0.25	\$40	\$25	\$35	\$105	0.10	\$105		
	1.1	Inspect for vegetation growth within pervious pavement	Kill vegetation within pervious pavement area	Laborer with herbicide and hackpack sprayer.	0.5	\$40	\$15	\$35	\$105	0.50	\$105	0.5	\$40	\$15	\$35	\$105	0.50	50 \$105	
Annual Once per year nspection and [prior to wet Maintenance season] (Conduct surface vacuuming wit street sweeper	Vacuum with street sweeper pervious pavement and surrounding contributing pavement.	Subcontractor capable of vacuuming, the parking lot with street sweeper. ²	0.5	\$95	\$0	\$48	\$48	0.05	\$48	0.5	%95	30	\$48	\$48	0.05	\$48	This actionate across	
	Conduct infiltration testing	Using ERIK procedures, determine th infiltration rate through the pervious pavemen: is at least 2.0 inches per hour.	Subcontractor or County staff qualified to perform test. Testing supplies. This test is assumed to occur concurrent with the semi-annual inspection for- accumulated settlement. Contractor should rehabilitate pawement by vacuuming with street sweeper. ⁸	т	\$60	\$100	\$160	\$160	0.05	\$160	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	This estimate assumed that rehabilitation of the pervious pavement is no required annually, but A would occur as part of a major restoration effort	
Annual Compliance Report	Anoually	N/A	N/A	Responsible Party to compile annual summary of relevant inspection and maintenance data. ⁹	4	\$75	\$0	\$300	\$300	0.00	\$300	4	\$75	\$0	\$300	\$300	0.00	\$300	
							Tota	l Annual Ma	aintenai	nce Cost	\$1,213	1		Tota	l Annual Ma	intenan	ce Cost:	\$858	



Example 10-Year Maintenance Cost Projection

Inflation Rate:		3%		User input i	inflation rate	e. The base	e rate of inflat	ion is 3%.				
		-	_		1	'ear			2	. 1		
Maintenance Activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Totals	
Monthly Trash and Debris Removal	\$300	\$309	\$318	\$328	\$338	\$348	\$358	\$369	\$380	\$391	\$3,439	
Triannual Minor Inspection, Cleaning, and Restoration	\$405	\$417	\$430	\$443	\$456	\$470	\$484	\$498	\$513	\$528	\$4,643	
Annual Inspection and Maintenance	\$208	\$214	\$220	\$227	\$234	\$241	\$248	\$255	\$263	\$271	\$2,379	
Annual Compliance Report	\$300	\$309	\$318	\$328	\$338	\$348	\$358	\$369	\$380	\$391	\$3,439	
	÷						Total 10	Year Ma	intenan	ce Cost:	\$13,900	
				10.0	1							





Traditional vs. LID Example - Maintenance Cost Comparison

Maintenance Scenario	Design Practice Size	Estimated Annual Maintenance (2013 Dollars)	Estimated 10-Year Maintenance (3% inflation)
Pervious Pavement	36792 sf	\$1,333	\$15,278
Bioretention	73846 sf	\$11,367	\$130,311
Rain Garden	26498 sf	\$5,877	\$67,377
Planter Box	2448 sf	\$1,804	\$20,684
Tree Box Filter	10 boxes	\$1,586	\$18,722
Curb Cuts / Inverted Medians	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stormwater Harvesting (w/ Cisterns)	134528 gal	\$9,120	\$104,548
Dry Retention Pond	92522 sf	\$11,303	\$133,462
	Totals:	\$42,390	\$490,382

Maintenance Scenario	Design Practice Size	Estimated Annual Maintenance (2013 Dollars)	Estimated 10-Year Maintenance (3% inflation)
Dry Retention Pond	132,675 sf	\$15,880	\$187,512
Landscaped Area	30,546 sf	\$5,889	\$69,542
Swale	73,843 sf	\$8,779	\$103,663
Wet Detention Pond	63,319 sf	\$4,451	\$49,095
	Totals:	\$34,999	\$409,812

~20% Costs Increase





Traditional vs LID Example Take Home Points

- With proper planning, significant cost savings may be achieved when considering land savings in new development scenarios
- LID approach may accommodate more water quality treatment in impaired waters basins
- LID approach may accommodate more infiltration in recharge areas
- Maintenance costs
 - May increase with LID practice applications
 - Focus on offset costs compared to traditional maintenance requirements
 - Enhanced water quality treatment offset may provide additional benefit
 - Long Term maintenance cost can be offset by up front capital savings



Promoting Green Infrastructure in Code

- Manual was created to promote an advanced stormwater management approach that is integrated with a revised land development code that incorporates a variety of green infrastructure or low impact development options to address stormwater quantity/quality standards as redevelopment occurs.
- The standards, herein, align with the State of Florida Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) and the administrative standards established by the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD).
- The County, through its codes and policies, will allow design flexibility while establishing quantity/quality goals to ensure a sustainable future.
- Manual is designed in three distinct parts that each address the stages of the stormwater design process:
 - Introduction and Site Planning
 - Pinellas Stormwater Requirements
 - Best Management Practices Catalog



Land Development Code Article II: Drainage Requirements

Sec. 154-52. - Pinellas County Stormwater Manual.

The Pinellas County Stormwater Manual is intended to provide detailed drainage requirements and guidelines for the construction of physical improvements in the unincorporated limits of the county and on Pinellas County owned infrastructure in the incorporated limits of Pinellas County. However, to the extent this article conflicts with a municipal ordinance, the more stringent criteria shall be met. The Pinellas County Stormwater Manual shall be adopted by ordinance of the county commission and kept on file in the development review services and public works departments.



Geosyntec^D

consultants

Green Infrastructure Siting Tools

- Develop a rating and suitability framework for siting GI as part of the new GI program
- End result to provide framework and toolset to evaluate water quality benefits and suitability to conceptualize and prioritize future GI projects
- Produce initial list of ranked GI projects
- Top ranked projects are conceptualized as proof of concept
- SOPs developed so COUNTY may easily replicate the results
- Establish standardized water quality benefit evaluation procedures



Structural BMPs	Structural Stormwater BMPs	Manual Section	Explicit Load Reduction Credit
SW1	Retention Basin	6.1	4
SW2	Exfiltration Trench	6.2	V
SW3	Underground Storage and Retention	6.3	Å
SW4	Treatment Swales	6.4	V
SW5	Vegetate Natural Buffers	6.5	4
SW6	Pervious Pavements	6.6	Ń
SW7	Green Roofs with Cisterns	6.7	1
SW8	Wet Detention Systems	6.8	V
SW9	Stormwater Harvesting/ Horizontal Wells	6.9	Å
SW10	Up-Flow Filter Systems	6.10	N
5W11	Managed Aquatic Plant Systems	6.11	~
SW12	Biofiltration Systems/Tree Box Filters	6.12	4
SW13	Rain gardens	6.13	V
SW14	Rainwater Harvesting/Cisterns	6.14	1
SC15	Rainfall Interceptor Trees	6.15	V







Bay Lake - Water Quality Retrofit

- Bay Lake Impaired for Nutrients
- Mixed land uses in contributing area
- 319 Grant for LID BMP Demonstration
- Modular Wetland Units with Filtration, Bioactivated Media, and Plant Uptake





Bay Lake - Post-Improvement Stormwater Flow





Bay Lake - Modular Wetlands





Bay Lake - Monitoring Equipment





Bay Lake - Maintenance

- High sediment loading from ditch-inflow caused filter chamber to clog
- Maintenance crews contributed to clogging with grass clippings getting into system
- System undersized for specific application













Bay Lake - Maintenance





<u> (1)</u>

Bay Lake - Results





	Percent Removal					
Dovomotor	Modular	Wetland				
Falalletei	North (Expanded Slate)	South (Bold & Gold)				
Orthophosphorus	26.6%	39.1%				
Total Phosphorus	38.1%	57.0%				
Ammonia	65.5%	73.0%				
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	44.3%	54.9%				
Nitrate / Nitrite	33.3%	-3.1%				
Total Nitrogen	38.6%	48.3%				
Total Suspended Solids	78.9%	82.8%				



• Impacts of Future Climate Change

- Sea Level Rise
- Groundwater Table Rise
- Changes in Hydrology More Intense Storms







Geosyntec <

consultants

2 (B) (P

Existing and Forecasted Estimated Nuisance Flooding Conditions at St. Augustine's Maria Sanchez Lake based on FDEO's 2016 *Coastal Vulnerability Assessment*



Existing12" SLR (2030s)24" SLR (2040s)







Increasing Tailwater (Tidal) Conditions

















Geosyntec[>]

consultants

Retention Pond / Bioretention / Rain Garden / Swale

Ground Surface



Average Groundwater Table Rise May Inhibit Performance of BMPs Relying on Infiltration





Exfiltration System / French Drains

Ground Surface



Average Groundwater Table Rise May Inhibit Performance of BMPs Relying on Infiltration





Pervious Pavement Systems

Pavement Surface



Average Groundwater Table Rise May Inhibit Performance of BMPs Relying on Infiltration





Traditional Stormwater Strategy



Receiving Water

Sensitive to Groundwater Table and Tailwater Elevation

> Centralized One Big Stormwater Facility for Attenuation and Treatment





- Future GI/LID BMP Strategies
 - Design for Future Conditions
 - Adapt Design Criteria to Changing Hydrologic Conditions
 - Evaluate Current BMP
 Performance Conditions
 - Retrofit Existing BMPs
 - Consider Active Control
 - Adaptive Management

Good Design Intentions.....

Good Design Intentions.....

Good Design Intentions.....

Thamk You !

Mark W. Ellard, PE, CFM, D.WRE, ENV SP

Senior Principal, Water Resources

Geosyntec Consultants

1511 East State Road 434, Suite 1005 Winter Springs, Florida 32708 Phone: 407-321-7030 WWW.geosyntec.com

engineers | scientists | innovators

- Multi-Objective Improvement
 - Road Diet
 - Flood reduction
 - Storm sewer rehabilitation
 - Water utility replacement
 - Landscaping
 - Linear Park

• Opportunities !

- Water Quality
 Improvement
- Low Impact Design (LID) Features

- Bioswales
- Rain Gardens
- Modular Wetland

TYPE 'C' INLET -

ABIOSWALE

A DETAIL

NONWOVEN

GEOTEXTILE

18" RIPRAP

GEOTEXTILE TO STRUCTURE WITH 1" CONCRETE ANCHORS

CONNECT NONWOVEN

AT 12" X 12" SPACING

RUBBLE (TYP)

CONCRETE FLUME

COMPACTED

Pre / Post Construction

Rain Gardens / Bioswales fed through curb cuts

Modular Planter Box

Stormwater Harvesting

Proposed Project

- Design, install, and monitor stormwater harvesting demonstration project at Orange County Public Works Maintenance Yard
- System to collect stormwater from Building 6 roof
- 10,300 gallon underground reservoir (PIPE-R)
- Provide water for spray trucks and jetter trucks
- Real-time control management of storage (OPTI)
- Monitor system for water quantity and water quality for 1 year

Stormwater Harvesting Site Layout

Stormwater Harvesting System Description

- Main Components
 - Reservoir storage layer
 - Storage of harvested water
 - 10,300 gallons
 - Control box
 - Controls the water level in the reservoir layer
 - Will use real-time control technology (smart controls)
 - Hold on to water when it is needed
 - Release water when it is not needed (before rain event)
 - Location of pump
 - Drainfield overflow
 - Allows water to infiltrate prior to discharge to drainage infrastructure
 - Recharge the groundwater

Stormwater Harvesting Roof Drain Details

Stormwater Harvesting Plan View of Site Layout

Stormwater Harvesting Installation

Stormwater Harvesting County Benefits

• Based on modeling results of this system the following benefits can be expected

- Reduce potable water use by estimated 70,000 gallons per year
 - Makes the County more sustainable
 - Cost savings
- Reduce stormwater leaving site by estimated 83% on an average annual basis
 - Reduce pressure on downstream drainage infrastructure
 - Improve water quality by reducing mass of pollutants discharged to surface water bodies
- Increase groundwater recharge by estimated 46,000 gallons per year
- Gives County experience with new, state-of-the-art technology (real-time controls) and new stormwater practice (harvesting)
- Demonstrate benefits of real-time control stormwater management strategy

Geosyntec[>]