

What do you hope to get out of this session? (SELECT MULTIPLE)

- General information about post-construction stormwater BMPs.
- Information about how your document can help me.
- How to use the tool.
- Other "insert short answer"





# Notes:

We have started the seminar with all phone lines muted to prevent background noise. Please keep your phone lines muted during the seminar to minimize disruption and background noise. During the question and answer break, press #6 to unmute your lines to ask a question (note: \*6 to mute again). Also, please do NOT put this call on hold as this may bring unwanted background music over the lines and interrupt the seminar.

Use the "Q&A" box to ask questions, make comments, or report technical problems any time. For questions and comments provided out loud, please hold until the designated Q&A breaks.

*Everyone* – please complete the feedback form before you leave the training website. Link to feedback form is available on last slide.



The Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC) is a state-led coalition of regulators, industry experts, citizen stakeholders, academia and federal partners that work to achieve regulatory acceptance of environmental technologies and innovative approaches. ITRC consists of all 50 states (and Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) that work to break down barriers and reduce compliance costs, making it easier to use new technologies and helping states maximize resources. ITRC brings together a diverse mix of environmental experts and stakeholders from both the public and private sectors to broaden and deepen technical knowledge and advance the regulatory acceptance of environmental technologies. Together, we're building the environmental community's ability to expedite quality decision making while protecting human health and the environment. With our network of organizations and individuals throughout the environmental community, ITRC is a unique catalyst for dialogue between regulators and the regulated community.

For a state to be a member of ITRC their environmental agency must designate a State Point of Contact. To find out who your State POC is check out the "contacts" section at www.itrcweb.org. Also, click on "membership" to learn how you can become a member of an ITRC Technical Team.

Disclaimer: This material was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof and no official endorsement should be inferred.

The information provided in documents, training curricula, and other print or electronic materials created by the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council ("ITRC" and such materials are referred to as "ITRC Materials") is intended as a general reference to help regulators and others develop a consistent approach to their evaluation, regulatory approval, and deployment of environmental technologies. The information in ITRC Materials was formulated to be reliable and accurate. However, the information is provided "as is" and use of this information is at the users' own risk.

ITRC Materials do not necessarily address all applicable health and safety risks and precautions with respect to particular materials, conditions, or procedures in specific applications of any technology. Consequently, ITRC recommends consulting applicable standards, laws, regulations, suppliers of materials, and material safety data sheets for information concerning safety and health risks and precautions and compliance with then-applicable laws and regulations. ITRC, ERIS and ECOS shall not be liable in the event of any conflict between information in ITRC Materials and such laws, regulations, and/or other ordinances. The content in ITRC Materials may be revised or withdrawn at any time without prior notice.

ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS make no representations or warranties, express or implied, with respect to information in ITRC Materials and specifically disclaim all warranties to the fullest extent permitted by law (including, but not limited to, merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose). ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS will not accept liability for damages of any kind that result from acting upon or using this information.

ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS do not endorse or recommend the use of specific technology or technology provider through ITRC Materials. Reference to technologies, products, or services offered by other parties does not constitute a guarantee by ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS of the quality or value of those technologies, products, or services. Information in ITRC Materials is for general reference only; it should not be construed as definitive guidance for any specific site and is not a substitute for consultation with qualified professional advisors.



What is your role in stormwater management?

- I select stormwater BMPs (Best Management Practices) at sites
- I install or maintain stormwater BMPs at sites
- I review, approve, and/or inspect stormwater BMPs
- I regulate stormwater BMPs, but I am not involved in the selection of stormwater BMPs
- I advise others on stormwater program requirements
- · I am a provider of stormwater BMP technologies and/or approaches
- I have no role in stormwater management
- Other "insert short answer"

**Rebecca Higgins** is a Senior Hydrogeologist in the East Metro Unit of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) in St. Paul. In her roll at the MPCA, she is a member of the team assigned to evaluate releases of hazardous substances and PFAS compounds that pose a risk to human and ecological receptors. Rebecca also serves as liaison between the stormwater program and remediation divisions of the MPCA. In that role she seeks to find innovative technical solutions for sites where contamination poses a risk to human health and the environment from infiltrated stormwater. Rebecca is an ITRC Point-of-Contact for the State of Minnesota and a Co-Team Leader the Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation Team. She earned a Bachelor's degree in Geology from North Dakota State University in 1998 and spent 9 years in the environmental consulting industry in Colorado and Minnesota until joining the MPCA in 2007. Rebecca is a licensed Professional Geologist in the state of Minnesota.



Have you or are you currently using the ITRC Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) Performance Evaluation guidance document?

- Yes, I am using the document
- Not yet, but I plan to use the document within the next 6 months
- No, I am not using the document
- I was not aware of this document until this panel session

## Poll Question:

What is your level of expertise in post-construction stormwater?

- I am an expert
- I have a few years experience and work with post-construction stormwater issues on a regular basis
- I have a little knowledge, but don't work with post-construction stormwater issues the field very often
- I know nothing about post-construction stormwater, and am looking to expand my overall knowledge base









**Patrick Hsieh** is a Senior Engineer with Dalton, Olmsted, & Fuglevand (DOF) based out of their Seattle, Washington office. Since 2016, Patrick has worked at DOF specializing in managing environmental concerns at complex sites (upland and sediment remediation as well as environmental compliance) with a focus on stormwater management for industrial clients in the Pacific Northwest. He is responsible for the completion of feasibility studies, corrective action plans, and engineering design for cleanups at superfund sites as well as for supporting environmental compliance engineering design at active industrial manufacturing facilities.

He has led the design and operation and maintenance (O&M) of air sparging, soil vapor extraction, groundwater extraction and treatment, stormwater treatment, dredge return water treatment, and in situ bioremediation systems for environmental remediation projects throughout the country. He has directed clients in improving industrial stormwater treatment to reach benchmarks, designed stormwater facilities to meet low impact development goals and aided clients in negotiations with regulators and third party groups. Patrick has evaluated the efficacy of hundreds of water treatment devices or best management practices to treat for metals, polychlorinated biphenyls, suspended solids, pH, volatile organic compounds, 1,4-dioxane, turbidity, chemical and biological oxygen demand in stormwater and wastewater.

Prior to DOF, he worked for 11 years in the environmental consulting field with AMEC Earth and Environmental (previously Geomatrix). Since 2016, Patrick has contributed to ITRC as a team member and trainer for ITRC's Stormwater BMP Evaluation team. Patrick earned a bachelor's (2001) and master's (2003) degree in chemical engineering from University of Rochester in Rochester, New York Patrick is certified as a Professional Engineer in Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and Nevada.

Allison Dunaway manages the Wetland and Stream Protection Program and the Construction Stormwater Program at the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Piedmont Regional Office. Over the last 20 years, Allison has worked in the public and private sectors performing water quality monitoring, water and wetlands permitting and inspections, and air, water and waste program enforcement and policy development. She currently supervises a staff of 14 environmental specialists who evaluate permit applications, review plans and conduct compliance inspections related to the wetland and stream protection program and the construction stormwater program. Allison has been active in ITRC since 2011, serving on the Biochemical Reactors for Mining Influenced Waters team from 2011 to 2013 and as a sub-group leader on the Long Term Contaminant Management Using Institutional Controls team from 2014-2015. Since 2016, she has served as the co-team leader on the Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation team. Allison earned a bachelor's degree with distinction in environmental science from the University of Virginia in 2000, and a master's in environmental science and engineering from Virginia Tech in 2003.

**Brandon Steets** is a Senior Principal at Geosyntec Consultants in Santa Barbara, California. He has served as a consultant since 2000 and specializes in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulations, water quality modelling and monitoring, pollutant source investigation, and stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) planning and design. Brandon has led watershed modeling to plan over \$6 billion in new green infrastructure and demonstrate compliance with TMDL limits. He has led numerous award winning projects, including biofilter design for the Boeing Santa Susana Field Laboratory (2013 CASQA award) and microbial and nutrient source tracking for the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (2018 NACWA award).He has performed training for the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and for numerous municipalities across the United States Brandon recently advised the National Academy of Sciences industrial stormwater committee regarding recommendations for U.S. EPA's 2020 Multi-Sector General Permit renewal. He received his BS in environmental engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1998 and his MS in environmental engineering from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 2000. He is a licensed professional chemical engineer (CA), and California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) certified Qualified Industrial Stormwater Practitioner and Trainer of Record.



**Toni McCrory** is a Director in U.S. Environmental, Health, and Safety Compliance for Walmart, Inc in Bentonville, AR. Toni has worked within the water compliance field since 2008. She oversees all water-related compliance programs (stormwater, wastewater, pretreatment, drinking water, groundwater, wetlands, and water reuse) for over 5200 U.S. facilities. In her role, Toni has developed, implemented, and refined national stormwater programs by generating innovative compliance solutions for performance-based contract management, predictive analytics for asset management, and digital transformation. Toni has been an active member of ITRC since the inception of the Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation team in 2016 and is currently a trainer for the team. Toni earned her bachelor's degree in biological and agricultural engineering from the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Arkansas in 2007 and a master's in business administration from John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Arkansas in 2010.

**Chris Nickell** is the Director of Environmental Health and Safety at Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa, since 2015. He oversees the Universities environmental compliance. Before joining Drake, he worked in the private sector in Environmental Health and Safety, and as an environmental compliance consultant. Prior to working in the public sector Chris served in the United States Air Force, where he was an Emergency and Disaster Manager. He also holds both the Certified Safety Professional (CSP) and Certified Hazardous Materials Manager (CHMM) designations. Chris is a member of the ITRC Stormwater BMP Performance Evaluation Team. He joined the team in 2017 and served as the operations and maintenance sub team lead. He graduated with a bachelor's degree in Emergency and Disaster Management from Upper Iowa University in 2009.

Kevin Michael Lienau, PE is a Corporate Engineering Manager / Principle with Groundwater and Environmental Services, Inc. (GES) located in GES' Eagan, Minnesota office. Since 1992, Kevin has worked at GES specializing in investigation, remediation, and site progression of a wide variety of industrial and petroleum projects. Contaminants of concern include both chlorinated and non-chlorinated hydrocarbon sites. With his knowledge of varied contaminants and remedial techniques, Kevin also provides third-party review services to clients.

Other areas of expertise include industrial facility auditing, spill prevention, control, and countermeasure (SPCC) plan preparation, stormwater pollution prevention (SWPP) plan preparation, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and underground injection control permit acquisition and compliance, analysis and implementation of feasibility tests, control system design, electrical code classification/interpretation, and PLC programming. Additionally, Kevin has extensive experience in landfill leachate and gas system operations, maintenance, design, and control.

Since 2015, Kevin has contributed to ITRC as a team member and now trainer for ITRC's Stormwater Best Management Practices Performance Evaluation team. Kevin earned a bachelor's degree in Chemical Engineering and a bachelor's degree in Material Science and Engineering from the University of Minnesota - Twin Cities in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1992. Kevin is a licensed professional engineer in 21 states.



**Patrick Hsieh** is a Senior Engineer with Dalton, Olmsted, & Fuglevand (DOF) based out of their Seattle, Washington office. Since 2016, Patrick has worked at DOF specializing in managing environmental concerns at complex sites (upland and sediment remediation as well as environmental compliance) with a focus on stormwater management for industrial clients in the Pacific Northwest. He is responsible for the completion of feasibility studies, corrective action plans, and engineering design for cleanups at superfund sites as well as for supporting environmental compliance engineering design at active industrial manufacturing facilities.

He has led the design and operation and maintenance (O&M) of air sparging, soil vapor extraction, groundwater extraction and treatment, stormwater treatment, dredge return water treatment, and in situ bioremediation systems for environmental remediation projects throughout the country. He has directed clients in improving industrial stormwater treatment to reach benchmarks, designed stormwater facilities to meet low impact development goals and aided clients in negotiations with regulators and third party groups. Patrick has evaluated the efficacy of hundreds of water treatment devices or best management practices to treat for metals, polychlorinated biphenyls, suspended solids, pH, volatile organic compounds, 1,4-dioxane, turbidity, chemical and biological oxygen demand in stormwater and wastewater.

Prior to DOF, he worked for 11 years in the environmental consulting field with AMEC Earth and Environmental (previously Geomatrix). Since 2016, Patrick has contributed to ITRC as a team member and trainer for ITRC's Stormwater BMP Evaluation team. Patrick earned a bachelor's (2001) and master's (2003) degree in chemical engineering from University of Rochester in Rochester, New York Patrick is certified as a Professional Engineer in Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and Nevada.







What type of organization do you represent?

- City/local government
- State government
- Federal government
- Technology vendor
- Consultant
- Community stakeholder
- Other

## Poll Question:

What are challenges that you've experienced when evaluating a BMP for use on a site? (Note: The challenges could be experienced from a site design, approving-authority or owner perspective.) [select all that apply]

- It's difficult to find data to determine if the BMP will be effective.
- There's no standard, national protocol to certify or prove a BMP will be effective.
- I'm unsure if the maintenance requirements of the BMPs will be acceptable to the client and/or the approving authority.
- I don't have reliable information on short- and long-term costs.
- Other





18	Stormwater Best Management Practices Performance Evaluation (Stormwater-1) Oct-18	ERSTATE *
	Welcome! X ITRC Stormwater Post-Construction BMP Evaluation Tool This tool is not an exhaustive list of potential pollutants treated by post-construction BMPs. The pollutants included here are explicitly regulated by state or local permit requirements. These pollutants are not exclusive to the presence of an industrial activity or pollutants for which TMDLs impairments exist. These information sheets are not intended to be guidance and are not independent of the text of this guidance. These information sheets are intended as information that will inform the user on BMP components and help them access additional information. Additonal information and references can be found in each BMP information sheet, as well as, the Stormwater BMP Evaluation documentation located at the ITRC website (https://www.itrcweb.org/). OK	







# <sup>22</sup> **BMP Information Sheet** Description & Pollutant Summary



F.10 Permeable Pavement

December 2018

### Description

Permeable or porous pavement has a higher than normal percentage of air voids to allow water to pass through it and infiltrate into the subsoil or collect in an underdrain system. Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook and Stormwater Standards

#### Pollutants of Concern Treated by Permeable Pavement

Permeable Pa	avement									
Solids	Solid Metals	<b>Dissolved Metals</b>	Hydro Carbons	Nutrients	Ammonia	PH	Bacteria Pathogens	Organics	Trash	Pesticides Herbicides
TSS	Cu		0/G	Phosphorus				PCB		
SSC	Zn	Zn	трн					PAH		
Turbidity	Pb									
Total Solids	Ni	Ni								



# <sup>23</sup> BMP Information Sheet Data Summary



International Stormwater BMP Database Performance Summary, 2016 – Porous Pavement International Stormwater BMP Database. Prepared for City and County of Denver and Urban Drainage and Flood Control District, February 2017. Prepared by Wright Water Engineers and Geosyntec Consultants (Consultants 2016)

	BM	IPs	EM	ICs	2	5th					N	ledian				75th	)
	In	Out	In	Out	In		Out			In		Out		Differen	ce l	n	Out
Kjeld						-		-									
Nitroge	en, NO <sub>x</sub>	as N (m	g/L)			7	7	388	220	0.34	0.85	0.59 (0.53, 0.62)	1.36 (1.22,	1.51)	***	0.88	2.06
Vitroge	en, Nitrit	te (NO <sub>2</sub> )	+ Nitrat	e (NO <sub>3</sub> ) a	s N (mg/L)	7	7	388	220	0.34	0.85	0.59 (0.53, 0.62)	1.36 (1.22,	1.51)	***	0.88	2.06
hospi	norus a	s P, Diss	olved (m	ng/L)		4	4	244	119	0.03	0.04	0.05 (0.04, 0.05)	0.05 (0.05,	0.07)	<b>◇◆◆</b>	0.08	0.10
hospi	norus a:	s P, Tota	il (mg/L)			8	8	373	219	0.12	0.07	0.19 (0.16, 0.21)	0.11 (0.10,	0.11)	***	0.36	0.20
Phospi	norus, o	rthopho	sphate	as P (mg)	/L)	, 6	6	174	114	0.03	0.03	0.05 (0.04, 0.06)	0.07 (0.05,	0.08)	<b>◇</b> ♦♦	0.08	0.12
Phosph	iorus a	s P, Tota	al (mg/L	.)		55	55	891	873	0.09	0.04	0.20 (0.18, 0.22)	0.09 (0	.08, 0.10)	***	0.42	0.2
boonk		rthophy	ponhoto	00 D (m)	1)	22	22	524	500	0.02	0.01	0.06 (0.05, 0.07)	0.02.0	02.0.03)		0.15	
Chrom	ium, Dis	solved	(μg/L)			4	4	292	133	0.50	1.70	0.50 (0.50, 0.50)	2.70 (2.30,	2.80)	***	0.50	3.80
Chrom	ium, To	tal (µg/l	_)			4	4	300	143	2.04	2.50	3.62 (3.40, 4.10)	4.28 (3.51,	5.06)	<>>>	6.60	7.23
Copper	, Dissol	ved (µg	/L)			7	7	381	216	2.80	3.00	5.00 (4.70, 5.50)	5.10 (4.40,	5.60)	◊ ◊ ♦	7.80	7.12
Copper	, Total (	(µg/L)				11	11	439	262	7.50	4.00	12.00 (10.80, 12.50)	7.70 (6.70,	8.00)	•••	23.30	13.76

# <sup>24</sup> BMP Information Sheet

# Design



[28] Certifications more commonly apply to products, or proprietary BMPs, which generally follow the demonstrative approach and must demonstrate they are effective. Most practices, or public domain BMPs such as permeable pavement, follow the presumptive approach and are presumed to be effective as long as they are built following the design criteria of the regulatory agency. Users should refer to their local regulatory agency for information on approved permeable pavement BMPs.

### Structural Design

- The subgrade is the layer below the paving and the subbase. Where traditional pavement tries to reduce water from
  entering the subgrade, permeable pavement allows for water to enter the subgrade.
- · The subbase is below the paving and provides vertical support, storage capacity and filtering ability.
- Pavement strength (i.e., concrete, paver, asphalt, etc.) is based on the material used and the design specifications for the area.
- Structural thickness can vary based on the local conditions, experience of using permeable pavements, and pavement mixture design.

### Stormwater Management Design

- Determine permeable pavement type (i.e., porous concrete, pervious pavers, non-pervious interlocking pavers, etc.).
- Consider three specific design features: 1) reduced runoff volume, 2) reduced treatment volume, and 3) reduced impervious area.
- · Determine if there is a stormwater treatment option considered and its effectiveness for the design considerations.



# <sup>25</sup> BMP Information Sheet Additional Information



### Example Submittals Checklist

American Concrete Institute (ACI) Specification for Pervious Concrete Pavement, ACI 522.1-13

### <u>Timeframe</u>

- · Hold pre-construction meeting and construct test sections to address construction issues.
- · Assemble materials on-site and ensure they meet design specifications.
- Follow erosion control measures according to an approved site plan (e.g., silt fence).
- · Follow general pervious concrete construction guidelines such as subgrade preparation and layout.
- Place paving material as per site specifications and industry standards:
  - Porous Asphalt see Jackson (2007)
  - Pervious Concrete see American Concrete Institute (2008)
  - Interlocking Pavers see Smith (2006)
- Consolidation
- Jointing
- Curing protection
  - · Cold weather protection
  - · Hot weather protection
- · Protect permeable pavement from adjacent stormwater runoff areas to avoid introduction of sediment

#### Example Inspection Checklist

• Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Design Specification No 7: Permeable Pavers, Version 2.0



# <sup>26</sup> BMP Information Sheet Sample Inspection Checklists



#### □ Filter Layer and Underdrain Placement

- All aggregates, including, as required, the filter layer (choker stone & sand), the reservoir layer, and bedding layer are clean and washed and otherwise conform to specifications as certified by quarry.
- Underdrain size and perforations meet the specifications.
- Placement of filter layer and initial layer of reservoir layer aggregates (approximately 2 inches) spread (not dumped) to avoid aggregate segregation; or
- Impermeable liner meets project specifications and is placed in accordance with manufacturers specifications.
- Placement of underdrain, observation wells, and underdrain fittings (45 degree wyes, cap at upstream end, etc.) in accordance with the approved plans.
- Invert elevations of underdrain and outlet structure and surface gradient in accordance with approved plans.
- Certification of Filter Layer and Underdrain Placement Inspection: Inspector certifies the successful completion of the filter layer and underdrain placement steps listed above.
- □ Stone Reservoir Aggregate Placement
  - □ Sides of excavation covered with geotextile, when required, prior to placing stone reservoir aggregate; no tears or holes, or excessive wrinkles are present.
  - Thickness, placement, compaction and surface tolerances meet specifications and approved plans.
  - □ Certification of Stone Reservoir Aggregate Placement Inspection: Inspector certifies the successful stone reservoir layer placement steps listed above.
- Bedding Layer and Pavement Installation



# <sup>27</sup> BMP Information Sheet O&M and More Information Sources



#### **Operation and Maintenance Considerations**

- Post signage to identify the porous pavement areas. Avoid typical measures for maintaining standard pavements
  including application of sand, salt and snow melting chemicals, seal coating and power washing.
- In winter, do not pile plowed snow on pavement to prevent concentrations of grit and nutrients from being deposited on pavement.
- Maintain stabilizing ground cover around pavement to prevent erosion and washing of sediment onto the permeable pavement surface.

#### References and Links

- American Concrete Institute (ACI) Pervious Concrete, ACI 522R-06
- American Concrete Institute (ACI) Report on Pervious Concrete, ACI 522R-10
- American Concrete Institute (ACI) Specification for Pervious Concrete Pavement, ACI 522.1-08
- American Concrete Institute (ACI) Specification for Pervious Concrete Pavement, ACI 522.1-13
- <u>California Department of Transportation Pervious Pavement Guidance</u>
- Jackson, N. 2007. Design, Construction and Maintenance Guide for Porous Asphalt Pavements. National Asphalt Pavement Association. Information Series 131. Lanham, MD. (Jackson 2007)
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Stormwater Manual: Permeable Pavement
- New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual
- North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality Stormwater Design Manual Minimum Design Criteria and Recommendations for Stormwater Control Measures C-5: Permeable Pavement
- S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, Permeable Interlocking Concrete Pavement, TechBrief Publication Number FHWA-HIF-15-007





What road blocks have you or others encountered when using the ITRC Stormwater BMP document? [short answer]



**Brandon Steets** is a Senior Principal at Geosyntec Consultants in Santa Barbara, California. He has served as a consultant since 2000 and specializes in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulations, water quality modelling and monitoring, pollutant source investigation, and stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) planning and design. Brandon has led watershed modeling to plan over \$6 billion in new green infrastructure and demonstrate compliance with TMDL limits. He has led numerous award winning projects, including biofilter design for the Boeing Santa Susana Field Laboratory (2013 CASQA award) and microbial and nutrient source tracking for the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (2018 NACWA award). He has performed training for the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and for numerous municipalities across the United States. Â Brandon recently advised the National Academy of Sciences industrial stormwater committee regarding recommendations for U.S. EPA's 2020 Multi-Sector General Permit renewal. He received his BS in environmental engineering from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1998 and his MS in environmental engineering from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 2000. He is a licensed professional chemical engineer (CA), and California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) certified Qualified Industrial Stormwater Practitioner and Trainer of Record.

<sup>30</sup> Use of BMP Perfor Contained in Tool	m Inter		1Ce 3Se	BMF		a tu	ta 10	a dy sumr	nary St	Xa atistics Tat	mp		* COUNCIL *	INTERSTA	* TECHNOLOGY *
<ul> <li>Scenario: Engineer assesses site, finds low infiltration rates, then seeks a flow-through treatment option that meets aesthetic needs</li> </ul>	Prepa Water	nwater E red for Ci Engineer	ty and County of s and Geosynte	e of De ec Ci BM In	nver a onsult (Ps <sup>[1]</sup> Out	and Ur ants. EM In	ban D (Wrig) Ds <sup>[2]</sup> Out	trainage nt Water 21 In	and Floc Enginee Rh Out	od Control Di rs and Geos Median Co In	strict, Februar intec ( <u>Consul</u> ncentration <sup>21</sup> Out 220 (59	y 2017. Pre tants 2016 Difference <sup>9</sup>	71 8 In 2 400	iright Sth Out	
and is eff pollutants 303(d) lis	97	96	110	1	8	C	1,2 (20 2,10	00 )0, )0)	24	10 (77, 280)	0 <b>•</b> •	•	5,900	1,100	i
<i>coli</i> and total copper. Tool is used, biofilter/bioretention is identified.	Nitro	gen, NO, a	s N (mg/L)	26	26	508	434	0.21	0.18	0.35 (0.32, 0.38)	0.43 (0.38. 0.50)	•••	0.55	1.14	
<ul> <li>Question: What information can I present to show how effective my</li> </ul>	(mg/ Nitro Nitra	gen, Nitrite te (NO <sub>5</sub> ) ar	r (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + s N (mg/L)	23	23	462	394	0.21	0.17	0.41)	0.56) 0.42 (0.35, 0.51)	0.00	0.56	1.24	
BMP will be?	Nitro	gen, Total	(mg/L)	17	17	289	238	0.77	0.65	1.24 (1.06, 1.35)	1.04 (0.88, 1.14)	•••	2.25	2.08	
<ul> <li>Answer: effluent concentrations and statistically significant</li> </ul>	(mg/ Phos	phorus as L) phorus as	P; Total (mg/L)	4 30	30	583	62 505	0.07	0.25	0.11 (0.08, 0.12)	0.40 (0.33, 0.50)	•••	0.23	0.88	
difference	Phos as P	phorus, or (mg/L)	thophosphate	20	19	316	269	0.01	0.04	0.15) 0.02 (0.02, 0.03)	0.28) 0.27 (0.18, 0.29)	•••	0.09	0.46	
BOREENIDE AREA TREUTARY AREA	Total	suspende	d solids (mg/L)	25	25	520	463	18.0	4.0	40.6 (36.0, 46.0)	10.0 (8.0, 10.0)	•••	99.2	18.5	_
Copper, 14 14 Total (µg/L)	333	300	4.90	3	57	(°	20 ( 9.9	(7.66, 97)	5.7	0 (5.09, 6.08)	**	• ]	19.10	10.0	0
	Iron, Total	(µg/L)		4	4	54	52	272.50	500.00	556.3 (378.0, 645.0)	1100.0 (560.0, 1200.0)	•••	827.50	1,740.00	
	Lead Disso	olved (µg/L	)	5	5	118	108	0.03	0.02	0.07 (0.05, 0.08)	0.05 (0.03, 0.06)	•••	0.13	0.10	7
Source: Ventura County Technical Guidance Manual	Total	(µg/L) H,		3	3	82	76	2.25	2.76	3.10 (2.01, 4.59) 3.55 (2.88,	0.32 (0.21, 0.42) 3.81 (3.15,	•••	6.75	5.94	) s

Difference diamonds:

Left diamond: overlap of 95% confidence intervals (strongest)

Middle: whether medians are statistically different from each other, mann whitney test (least strong)

Right: wilcoxen rank sum test on paired influent-effluent, very useful for flow-through BMPs with short residence times (so not wet ponds)

Robu	stness of dataset (no	ote	_	Intern Storr Prepa Water	national nwater I red for Ci Enginee	Stormwater BMP Databas ity and County rs and Geosynt	BMF E	nver a	ind Ur	ban Di	5 Sumn rainage t Water	and Floc	atistics Tab od Control Dis rs and Geosy	i <b>le – Bioret</b> strict, Februa mtec ( <u>Consu</u>	ention Inte iry 2017. Pre iltants 2016	pared by Wi	right
Pollut	ant concentration						BM	p <sub>s</sub> lil	EM	29 <sup>[2]</sup>	25	Sth	Median Con	centration <sup>[3]</sup>		75	ah .
increa	ant concentration	211		Enter	ococcus (	(MPN/100 mL)	3	3	48 48	49	180	32	590 (220,	220 (58,	© ● ●	2,400	2,200
and in	ron)			E. co (MP)	li 4/100 mL)		7	7	97	96	110	18	920) 1.200 (200, 2.100)	440) 240 (77. 280)	•••	5.900	1.100
How t	the BMP achieves th	IS		Kjeld (ma/	Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) (mg/L)			23	451	390	0.62	0.64	1.10 (1.07, 1.24)	1.39 (1.14, 1.40)	000	2.20	2.39
remov	val (e.g., removing			Nitro	gen, NO <sub>x</sub> i	as N (mg/L)	26	26	508	434	0.21	0.18	0.35 (0.32, 0.38)	0.43 (0.38, 0.50)	•••	0.55	1.14
partic	iculate copper only, so				gen, Nitra	te (NO3) as N	4	4	45	40	0.19	0.27	0.35 (0.24, 0.41)	0.48 (0.29, 0.56)		0.48	0.88
based	expect less copper-			Nitro	gen, Nitrit te (NO <sub>3</sub> ) a	e (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + s N (mg/L)	23	23	462	394	0.21	0.17	0.35 (0.31, 0.38)	0.42 (0.35, 0.51)	<b>**</b>	0.56	1.24
			_	Nitro	gen, Total	(mg/L)	17	17	289	238	0.77	0.65	1.24 (1.05,	1.04 (0.88,	000	2.25	2.08
	E. coli (MPN/100 mL)		7	97	96	110		18		1,2 (20 2,10	00 )0, 00)	2	40 (77, 280)	•	"]	5,900	1,100
	Phosphorus as P, Total (mg/L)	30	30	583	505	0.07	0.	08	0	.13 ( 0.1	0.12, 5)	0.2	4 (0.18, 0.28)	+1	)	0.26	0.59
	Iron,	4	4	54	52	272.50	500	).00	ŕ	556 (378	).3 3.0,	1	100.0 560.0, 200.0)	•	<u> </u>	827.50	1,740.0
	Total (µg/L)								•	~~~	.~)		/				
	Total (µg/L)			_	_		-		2		,			1000.00		1 1	

Case Study Exa	m	p	e -	mationa		IC BMI	<b>Dr</b> P Data	ir	ng Perf	formar	<b>Dp</b>	tio	<b>NS</b> 6 - Media Filt	ers	council *	TRC
• Question: Media filter is another option for the site	,		Prep. Wate	ared for ( r Enginee	City and Count; ers and Geosy	r of D ntec C BM	enver a Consult Palixi	and Ur tants. ( EMC	rban D (Wrig) (s <sup>(1)</sup>	Drainage ht Wate	e and Floo r Engineer 25th	d Control D rs and Geos Ma Concert	istrict, February syntec ( <u>Consultr</u> idian tration <sup>[13]</sup>	2017. Pre ants 2016)	pared by \ )	Wright 75th
though would it	15	15	184	169	120	3	3	90	00 (4 1,50	400, 0)	400 ( 80	200, 0)	<b>**</b>	10	,000	5,600
for my ( Copper, Total (µg/L)	20	20	345	330	4.97	2.	46	9.9	98 (8 10.0	1.60, 0)	5.53 ( 6.3	4.58, 0)	***	10	5.87	10.00
• Answer: similar (using Fe	ca		Nitri (mg	ogen, Nitra /L)	ite (NO <sub>3</sub> ) as N	12	12	178	174	0.20	0.30	0.32 (0.28, 0.35)	0.56 (0.46, 0.63)	•••	0.59	0.94
Coliform as surrogate for	E.		Nitri Nitri	ogen, Nitri até (NO <sub>3</sub> ) i	te (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + as N (mg/L)	10	9	168	154	0.24	0.38	0.35 (0.31, 0.40)	0.57 (0.48, 0.68)	•••	0.58	0.94
coli), and without the incre	eas	es	Nitr	ogen, Tota	l (mg/L)	10	9	160	151	0.79	0.73	1.22 (1.03, 1.33)	1.05 (0.90,	00 <b>0</b>	2.10	1.72
in phosphorus and iron			Pho	sphorus a	s P, Dissolved	11	10	118	100	0.01	0.02	0.05 (0.03,	0.04 (0.03,	00 <b>0</b>	0.09	0.10
<ul> <li>But greater confidence</li> </ul>	) in		Pho	sphorus a	s P, Total	23	22	372	349	0.07	0.04	0.15 (0.13,	0.09 (0.07,	***	0.28	0.16
nitrate increase (likely			Pho	sphorus, c	orthophosphate	7	7	116	115	0.02	0.02	0.04 (0.03,	0.03 (0.02,	00 <b>0</b>	0.09	0.07
converted from organic	С		Tota (mo	(mg/L)	led solids	25	25	400	377	22.0	3.9	0.05)	0.04) 9.0 (6.4, 10.0)	•••	120.0	22.8
nitrogen)			Cop	per, Disso	lved (µg/L)	11	11	189	176	1.63	1.50	3.75 (2.70)	3.25 (2.53,	00.	7.60	6.90
Phosphorus as P, Total (mg/L)	23	22	372	349	0.07	0.	04	0,1	15 (0 0.15	).13, 5)	0.09 ( 0.1	0.07, 0)	***	) °	.28	0.16
Iron, Total (µg/L)	8	7	153	132	267.76	113	3.23		642. 452. 755.(	3 2, 0)	209 (162 256	),7 2.8, .9)	***	1,4	60.00	420.6

# <sup>33</sup> Other Uses - Evaluating BMP's Reliability For Meeting Permit Limits



at 50 ug/L copper, limit is 10		ion englis	er and Geosy	BM	p <sub>s</sub> tizt	EMO	annigi Satist		25th	Me	dian	anaenta 2016))	7	5th
ug/L, how consistently will				In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	Difference <sup>[29]</sup>	In	Out
media filter meet this limit?	Fi rr	ecal Colifor :L)	m (MPN/100	15	15	184	169	120	33	900 (400, 1,500)	400 (200, 800)	° • •	10,000	5,60
Answer: 75% of effluent	К. ()	jeldahl nitro ng/L)	gen (TKN)	21	20	323	312	0.56	0.29	0.94 (0.83, 1.02)	0.50 (0.43, 0.55)	•••	1.78	1.00
samples <=10 ug/L, but at 17	N	itrogen, NO	, as N (mg/L)	22	21	346	328	0.21	0.34	0.34 (0.31, 0.37)	0.57 (0.49, 0.63)	•••	0.58	0.94
ug/L influent (takeaway: select	N 0	itrogen, Nit na/L)	rate (NO <sub>3</sub> ) as N	12	12	178	174	0.20	0.30	0.32 (0.28, 0.35)	0.56 (0.46, 0.63)	•••	0.59	0.94
pretreatment BMP to meet ~17	N	itrogen, Nit	rite (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + as N (mg/L)	10	9	168	154	0.24	0.38	0.35 (0.31, 0.40)	0.57 (0.48, 0.68)	•••	0.58	0.94
[i.e., treatment train concept])	N	itrogen, Tot	al (mg/L)	10	9	160	151	0.79	0.73	1.22 (1.03, 1.33)	1.05 (0.90, 1.16)	000	2.10	1.72
For more info: Look at paired	P (r	hosphorus ng/L)	as P, Dissolved	11	10	118	100	0.01	0.02	0.05 (0.03, 0.06)	0.04 (0.03, 0.06)	00 <b>0</b>	0.09	0.10
influent-effluent in BMP	P	hosphorus ng/L)	as P, Total	23	22	372	349	0.07	0.04	0.15 (0.13, 0.15)	0.09 (0.07, 0.10)	•••	0.28	0.16
Database to match 50 ug/L	P	hosphorus, s P (ma/L)	orthophosphate	7	7	116	115	0.02	0.02	0.04 (0.03, 0.05)	0.03 (0.02, 0.04)	000	0.09	0.07
influent, and review design info	T	otal susper	ded solids	25	25	400	377	22.0	3.9	56.4 (46.0, 61.9)	9.0 (6.4, 10.0)	•••	120.0	22.8
(e.g., media type, contact time)	0	opper, Diss	olved (µg/L)	11	11	189	176	1.63	1.50	3.75 (2.70,	3.25 (2.53,	000	7.60	6.90
	C	opper, Tota	(µg/L)	20	20	345	330	4,97	2.46	9.98 (8:60,	5.53 (4.58,	•••	16.87	10.0
Copper, Total (µg/L) 20 20	345	330	4.97	2.4	6	9.9 1	8 (8. 0.00	.60, ))	5.53 (4 6.30	4.58, D)	***	16.8	87	10.00

_	unstion: Can BMP ma	ot		Prep	rnational ared for C	Stormwater	of De	Data	abase and Ur	e Perf	<b>orman</b> rainage	and Floo	m <b>ary, 2016</b> d Control D	<ul> <li>Media Fi strict, Februa</li> </ul>	<b>ilters</b> iry 2017. Pre	pared by W	right
b	iostimulatory criteria for	tot	al	Wate	er Enginee	rs and Geosyr	tec C BM	onsult Pgt121	emc	(Wrigh	t Water 2	Engineer	Median Concentration <sup>[13]</sup>		ltants 2016	)) 71	5th
n 1	itrogen/total phosphoru .0/0.1 mg/L?	s at		Feci mL)	al Coliform	(MPN/100	<b>In</b> 15	<b>Out</b> 15	In 184	<b>Out</b> 169	In 120	Out 33	In 900 (400, 1,500)	Out 400 (200, 800)	Difference <sup>D</sup>	10,000	<b>0</b> wt 5,60
				Kjeli (mg	dahl nitrog /L)	en (TKN)	21	20	323	312	0.56	0.29	0.94 (0.83, 1.02)	0.50 (0.43, 0.55)	•••	1.78	1.00
A	nswer: TN median is c	lose	Э	Nitr	ogen, NO <sub>X</sub>	as N (mg/L)	22	21	346	328	0.21	0.34	0.34 (0.31, 0.37)	0.57 (0.49, 0.63)	•••	0.58	0.9
b	ut above, TP media is c	los	е	Nitri (mg	ogen, Nitra I/L)	te (NO <sub>3</sub> ) as N	12	12	178	174	0.20	0.30	0.32 (0.28, 0.35)	0.56 (0.46, 0.63)	•••	0.59	0.9
b	ut below, so this genera	al Bl	MΡ	Nitr	ogen, Nitrit ate (NO <sub>3</sub> ) a	e (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + s N (mg/L)	10	9	168	154	0.24	0.38	0.35 (0.31, 0.40)	0.57 (0.48, 0.68)	•••	0.58	0.9
t	pe is unlikely to consist	tent	ly	Nitr	ogen, Total	(mg/L)	10	9	160	151	0.79	0.73	1.22 (1.03, 1.33)	1.05 (0.90, 1.16)	00 <b>0</b>	2.10	1.7
а	chieve these limits, may	y ne	ed	Pho (mg	sphorus a: /L)	P, Dissolved	11	10	118	100	0.01	0.02	0.05 (0.03, 0.06)	0.04 (0.03, 0.06)	000	0.09	0.1
C	esign enhancements.			Pho (mg	sphorus at /L)	P, Total	23	22	372	349	0.07	0.04	0.15 (0.13, 0.15)	0.09 (0.07, 0.10)	***	0.28	0.1
	Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) (mg/L)	21	20	323	312	0.56	0.2	9	0.9	14 (0 1.02	.83, )	0.50 ( 0.5	0.43, 5)	***	1	.78	1.0
	Nitrogen, Nitrite (NO <sub>2</sub> ) + Nitrate (NO <sub>3</sub> ) as N (mg/L)	10	9	168	154	0.24	0.3	8	0.3	15 (0 0.40	.31, )	0.57 ( 0.6	0.48, 8)	•••	) °	.58	0.9
				-	Tree Con	0		-	162	122	263.76	119.00	10.00)	6.30)		1.440.00	100
							_	_	<u></u>		_		_				

For TN, consider saturated zone that will go anoxic to allow nitrate reduction, for TP consider iron-based media enhancements to sequester TP. Also outlet controls to increase contact time.

Two last things:

- 1. Data tables are also useful to support modeling to estimate load reductions achieved through BMP implementation scenarios.
- 2. Remember this concentration info is just one side of the load story. For loads to be reduced, also consider the volume reduction differences between sites (perc rates are site specific) and BMPs (eg, sizing, volume storage, etc.). There's also data on this in the BMP database, particularly for bioretention.



What is your interest in the development of a national program to certify BMP effectiveness?

- 1 no interest
- 2 some interest
- 3 significant interest



Do you feel more confident in applying the ITRC Stormwater BMP document?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure need to learn more

Think about projects that you are working on. In the next 6 months, how could you use this ITRC guidance? [short answer]

-----

Links to additional resources: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/xxxx/resource.cfm

Your feedback is important – please fill out the form at: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/xxxx/feedback.cfm

#### The benefits that ITRC offers to state regulators and technology developers, vendors, and consultants include:

- ✓Helping regulators build their knowledge base and raise their confidence about new environmental technologies
- ✓Helping regulators save time and money when evaluating environmental technologies
- ✓ Guiding technology developers in the collection of performance data to satisfy the requirements of multiple states
- ✓Helping technology vendors avoid the time and expense of conducting duplicative and costly demonstrations
- ✓ Providing a reliable network among members of the environmental community to focus on innovative environmental technologies

#### How you can get involved with ITRC:

✓ Join an ITRC Team – with just 10% of your time you can have a positive impact on the regulatory process and acceptance of innovative technologies and approaches

- ✓ Sponsor ITRC's technical team and other activities
- ✓Use ITRC products and attend training courses
- ✓ Submit proposals for new technical teams and projects