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## Increases in Urban Runoff for Lake Mendota from 2000 to 2020

- Amounts of Urban Runoff for 2000:

5,600,000,000 gallons or 17,000 acre-feet

- Amounts of Urban Runoff for 2020:

8,800,000,000 gallons or 27,500 acre-feet
(Increase of 57\%)







## Impacts of Urbanization on Stream Baseflows



## Impacts of Imperviousness on

## Surface and Groundwater Quantities

| Type of Resource | Increase <br> Imperviousness <br> From 2 to 18\% | Increase <br> Imperviousness <br> From 2 to 60\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stream Baseflow | -20\% | Dry Stream |
| Surface Runoff | + 90\% | +485\% |
| Regional <br> Groundwater <br> Levels | -10\% | -55\% |



## Predicted Temperature Increase

 Lowes Creek, Eau Claire
## Mean ( ${ }^{\circ}$ F) Maximum (F)
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The Hydrologic Cycle


## The <br> Runoff Management Rules

Presentation by the<br>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources



## Post-Construction Performance Standards - Peak Runoff

- Reduce peak runoff discharge rates, MEP, as compared to pre-development conditions for the 2 - year, 24 hour design storm.



## Post Construction Infilltration Performance Standards

By design, infilltrate sufficient runoff volume so that the post-development average annual infiltration volume shall be a portion of pre-development infiltration volume.

Residential
90\% (1\% Сар)

## Non-residential

60\% (2\% Сар)

## The Problem: Conventional Site Design

## Collect

Concentrate Convey
Centralized
Control


Good Drainage Parsodiam

## Conventional Pipe and Pond Centralized Control




## Distributed Small-scale Controls



Maintaining Natural Fyadrology Functions












BIORETENTION FILTER



## BIORETENTION \% POLLUTANT REMOVAL

|  |  | Cu | Pb | Zn | P | TKN | NH4 | NO3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Upper | 90 | 93 | 87 | 0 | 37 | 54 | -97 |
| O | Middle | 93 | 99 | 98 | 73 | 60 | 86 | -194 |
| $\mathbf{X}$ | Lower | 93 | 99 | 99 | 81 | 68 | 79 | 23 |
|  | Field | 97 | 96 | 95 | 65 | 52 | 92 | 16 |

Dr. Allen Davis, University of Maryland




## Landuse in the Lake Wingra Watershed




## \% Runoff Volume by Landuse for 4 Subwatersheds





## \% Annual Runoff Volumes from Source Areas in 4 Subwatersheds




| $\square$ Roof |
| :--- |
| $\square$ Plots |
| $\square$ Streets |
| $\square$ Lawns |
| $\square$ HWY |
| $\square$ Other |




## Sources of Annual Runoff Volume in Medium Density Residential
























## Plant List for Backyard Rain Gardens

## Shade Garden

- Jacobs Ladder
- Celandine Poppy
- Short's Aster
- Zig-Zag Goldenrod

Middle \& Big Garden

- Blue Flag Iris
- Purple Cone Flower
- Shooting Star
- Sweet Black-eyed Su.
- Smooth Penstemon
- Heartleaf Blue Aster
- Ohio Goldenrod
- Fire Pink
- Silky Wild Rye
- Northern Sea Oats


## Value of Using Native Plants



- Deeper roots - absorbs more water
- Uses no fertilizer
- Uses little or no pesticides
- Easy maintenance after first year
- Does not require watering in droughts after establishment












## \% Annual Runoff Volume by Source Area for St Francis



40\%

| $\square$ Roofs |
| :--- |
| $\square$ Playground |
| $\square$ Driveways |
| $\square$ Sidewalks |
| $\square$ Street Area |
| $\square$ Lawns |
| $\square$ Other Pervious |
| $\square$ Other Impervious |

## Elements of Low Impact Design for St. Francis Development

- Rain Gardens
- Infiltration Trenches in Street Boulevards
- Two Regional Infilltration Basins
- Reduce Street Width from 36 to 32 Feet
- Protection of Riparian Buffer

Steve Apfelbaum: Applied Ecological Services




## Infiltration Goals for Area 4 at St Francis

| Type of <br> Volume <br> Calculation | Annual <br> Infiltration <br> Volume, inches | Annual Runoff, <br> inches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Predevelopment | 28.0 | 0.8 |
| $90 \%$ Goal | 25.2 | 3.6 |
| No Controls | 24.4 | 4.4 |
| Volume Change | 0.8 | 0.8 (18\% of post <br> annual runoff) |

## Levels of Control for Each Infiltration Device in Area 4

| Type of <br> Practice | Additional <br> Infiltration | Percent of <br> 0.8 inches | \% Change to <br> Post Runoff |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rain Garden <br> (1/house) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Infiltration <br> Trenches | 3.7 | $460 \%$ | $84 \%(0.7 "$ <br> runoff) |
| Infiltration <br> Basin | 4.4 | $550 \%$ | $98 \%(0.1 "$ <br> runoff) |
| Rain Garden <br>  <br> 60\% of lawn) | 0.5 | $62 \%$ | $11 \%(3.9 "$ <br> runoff) |



West Bend, WI




Cedar Hill Site Design, Crossplains WI

Explanation
Wetpond Infiltrations Basin
Swales Sidewalk
Driveway
Houses
Lawns
Roadway
Woodlot
$500 \quad 0 \quad 5001000$ Feet


## Percent Runoff Volume by Source Area for Cedar Hills




## Elements of Low Impact Design for Cedar Hills Development

- Grass Swales
- Detention Pond
- Infiltration Basin
- Reduce Street Width (From 36 to 33 feet - park one side of street)












## Reductions Goals in Runoff Volume for Cedar Hills

| Type of <br> Volume <br> Calculation | Annual <br> Infiltration <br> Volume, in. | Annual <br> Runoff <br> Volume, in. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pre- <br> development | 28.0 | 0.8 |
| $90 \%$ Goal | 25.2 | 3.6 |
| No Controls | 22.5 | 6.3 |
| Volume <br> Change to <br> Achieve 90\% | 2.7 | 2.7 (43\% of <br> Postdevelop. <br> Runoff) |

## Volume Reduction Estimates for Practices at Cedar Hills

| Type of Practice | Addfitional <br> Infiltration <br> ,inches | $\%$ of 2.7 <br> inch goal | \% Reduction in <br> Annual Postdev. <br> Runoff |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 foot wide <br> streets | 0.3 | $11 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Grass Swales | 0.7 | $26 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Infiltration basin <br> - proper size | 1.7 | $63 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Total | 2.7 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ |
| Infiltration basin <br> -Actual size | 4.6 | $170 \%$ | $89 \%(0.7 "$ <br> runoff) |





## Infiltration Basin Monitoring



- ISCO refrigerated water-quality sampler
- CS double-bubbler stage sensor
-Tipping-bucket raingage
- H-flume
- Temperature probe

- Marsh-McBirney FLODAR system
> measures stage, velocity and discharge
science for a changing world


## Visual Clues to TSS Concentration Variation

Blue $=$ KP


Red = Bourbon


## Performance of Low-Impact Design Based on Annual Precipitation

| Water Year | Construction <br> Phase | Rainfall <br> (inches) | Volume Leaving <br> Basin (inches) | Percent of Volume <br> Retained (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Pre | 33.3 | 0.46 | $99 \%$ |
| 2000 | Active | 33.9 | 4.27 | $87 \%$ |
| 2001 | Active | 38.3 | 3.68 | $90 \%$ |
| 2002 | Active* | 29.4 | 0.96 | $97 \%$ |

[^0]
## Benefits of Rain Garden

- Help Protect and Restore Natural Hydrology of Your Watershed
- Trap Pollutants
- Attract Birds and Butterflies
- Attractive Addition to Property
- Enhance Beauty of City



## How Big to Make the Rain Garden

- How deep to make rain garden?
- What type of soil is at the site?
- What is the area draining to the rain garden?



## Rain Garden Depth

## Balance Between

## Depth and Surface Area

- Minimize drain time
- less than 1 day.
- Minimize digging.
- Suggest depths between 3 to 8 inches


## Selection of Rain Garden Depth Slope Very Important

- Slope $<4 \%=3$ to 5 inches deep.
- Slope of 5 to $7 \%=6$ to 7 inches deep.
- Slope of 8 to $12 \%$ = about 8 inches deep.
- Slope > 12 \% suggest another site.


## Importance of Soil Type

## Higher the Infiltration Rate the Smaller the Rain Garden Surface Area.

- Infiltration Rate of Sandy Soils: 2.5 in/hr
- Infiltration Rate of Silty Soils: $0.5 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$
- Infiltration Rate of Clayey Soils: $0.3 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$


## Determination of Soil Type

- Best method is to have soil analyzed.
- Use soil map - not too dependable because of possible disturbed soils in construction area.
- Use feel of soil.
- Do perk test - six inches deep




## Size of Drainage Area

Question: Is the rain garden treating rooftop and lawn or just rooftop runoff?


## Calculation of Drainage Area

Size of Roof


Example Calculation

- Length $=100$ feet
- Width $=20$ feet
- L X W = 2000 sq feet
- 2000 sq. ft. / 4 = 500 square feet


## Size Factors for Rain Gardens Less Than 30 feet from Downspout - 100\% Control

| Type of <br> Soil | 3 to 5 Inches <br> Deep | 6 to7 Inches <br> Deep | 8 Inches <br> Deep |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sandy | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.08 |
| Silty | 0.34 | 0.25 | 0.16 |
| Clayey | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.20 |

## Garden Size Calculation for Silty Soils and 4 Inch Depth

Size of Rooftop Draining to Garden X Size Factor = Size of Garden

500 square feet $\mathrm{X} 0.34=170$ square feet

Shape $=10$ feet X 17 feet

## Size Factors for Rain Gardens More Than 30

 Feet from Downspout - 100\% Control| Soil Type | All Depths Between 3 <br> and 8 inches |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sandy | 0.03 |
| Silty | 0.06 |
| Clayey | 0.10 |

## Variation in Rain Garden Size with Percent Reduction in Annual Runoff

Size for >30 feet from Downspout and Silty Soils



## Size of Bannerman Rain Garden

- Size $=180$ square feet or $30 \%$ of roof area.
- Depth is about 3.5 inches.
- Volume of Garden is about 55 cubic feet or it holds about 400 gallons of water.
- Volume is equal to the runoff from a 1 inch rainfall. Controls $60 \%$ of annual roof runoff.
- Infiltration rate is about 2 inches/hour

downhill stake
string uphill stake ${ }_{\uparrow}^{\downarrow}$
 , here


## downhill

stake






## List of Plants in Bannerman Rain Garden

- Blue False Indigo
- Red Milkweed
- Nodding Pink Onion
- Prairie Blazing Star
- Sq. Stemmed Sticky Monkey
- Sweet Black-Eyed Susan
- Ohio Goldenrod
- Prairie Dropseed
- Early summer
- Summer
- Summer
- Summer
- Summer
- Fall
- Fall
- All












## Maintenance of Rain Gardens

- First year requires vigilant weeding.
- Some watering at first, especially plants on berm.
- Dead plant debris should be removed in the spring.


## Cost of Rain Gardens

Cost of Landscape Contract in Dane County is about $\$ 12$ to $\$ 15$ per Square Foot. Includes Design, Construction, Plants, and Planting.





JORDAN COVE URBAN WATERSHEDPROJECT Waterford, Connecticut J. Alexopoulos \& J. Clausen

This project is funded in part by the CT DEP through the US EPA Nonpoint Source grant under § 319 of the Clean Water Act


BMP STUDY AREA
JORDAN COVE URBAN WATERSHED PROJECT Waterford, Connecticut
J. Alexopoulos \& J. Clausen
D. Gerwick, Engineering

This project is funded in part by the CT DEP through the US EPA
Nonpoint Source grant under § 319 of the Clean Water Act




## Bioretention Design







## Partnership for Rain

Gardens












[^0]:    * Site is approximately 75\%
    built-out

