

**Field Measurements of Non-Point Source Pollutant of Stormwater BMP's in the UD
Experimental Watershed**

March 31, 2004



Prepared to fulfill the requirements of:

Undergraduate Internships in Water Resources
Dr. Tom Sims, Director
Amy Boyd, Program Coordinator
Delaware Water Resources Center
Department of Plant and Soil Sciences
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716-1303

Prepared by:

Kathleen Cormier, Undergraduate Research Assistant
University of Delaware
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Food and Resource Economics Department,
Natural Resource Management
Newark, DE 19716

Project Advisors:

Jerry Kauffman PE, State Water Coordinator
Martin Wollaston, Senior Planner
University of Delaware
Institute for Public Administration - Water Resources Agency
DGS Annex
Newark, DE 19716

Acknowledgements

This research report was prepared by Kathleen Cormier to fulfill the requirements of the Undergraduate Internships in Water Resources program funded by the Delaware Water Resources Center and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. Many thanks to Dr. Tom Sims and Amy Boyd of the DWRC for their leadership in developing this program to provide opportunities for undergraduate research. A very special thanks to Martin Wollaston for securing the funding for this project, to Gerald Kauffman for all his help, and to Vern Svatos and Andrew Homsey for their assistance with sometimes temperamental Geographic Information Systems. Tom Taylor of the University of Delaware Facilities Management was extremely helpful in providing information about the construction of the stormwater BMPs on campus. Sincere gratitude is extended to researchers Kristen Sentoff, Judith Walker, Kevin Vonck, Sara Wozniak, David Levitt, Alex DeWire and Marlyse Williams for their assistance out in the field and in the office.

The University of Delaware is committed to assuring equal opportunity to all persons and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, gender, religion, ancestry, national origin, sexual orientation, veteran status, age or disability in its educational programs, activities, admissions or employment practices as required by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act, or other applicable statutes, and University policy. Inquiries concerning these statutes and information regarding campus accessibility should be referred to the Affirmative Action Officer, 305 Hullihen Hall, 302/831-2835 (voice), 302/831-4552 (TDD).

Abstract

On the University of Delaware Campus student researchers sought to examine the pollutant removal efficiency of several installed stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs). Stormwater BMPs are a candidate restoration strategy for the Christina Basin of northeastern Delaware and Southeastern Pennsylvania. This report seeks to obtain efficiency data for those stormwater BMPs already installed on the University of Delaware campus. Stormwater runoff was collected for three separate rainfall events at designated inflow and outflow stations in two stormwater BMPs—a bioretention site and a combination wetland swale. Results were mixed but promising. The conclusions drawn were that with continued maintenance and planting of native vegetation stormwater wetlands can be effective in protecting receiving waters.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
	Acknowledgements.....	<i>i</i>
	Abstract.....	<i>ii</i>
	Table of Contents.....	<i>iii</i>
	List of Figures.....	<i>iv</i>
	List of Exhibits.....	<i>iv</i>
One	Background and Justification.....	1
	Introduction.....	1
	Objectives.....	3
	Study Area.....	3
Two	Methodology.....	3
	Literature Review.....	3
	Field Survey.....	6
	Sampling Methods.....	11
	Analysis.....	12
Three	Results and Discussion.....	14
	Dickinson Bioretention Area.....	14
	Clayton Hall Wetland.....	17
	Pollutants of Urban Runoff.....	17
	Pollutant Removal Methods.....	20
	Results.....	21
Four	Conclusions and Implications.....	25
Five	References.....	28
	Exhibits.....	28

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1	Map of Stormwater Best Management Practices on and Adjacent to the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed.....	5
2	Dickinson Dormitory Bioretention Area Map.....	7
3	Dickinson Bioretention Wetland after Completion.....	9
4	Dickinson Bioretention Basin in the Rain	9
5	Clayton Hall Stormwater Wetland Map.....	10
6	Image of Clayton Hall Stormwater Swale Running Along the Alpha Sigma Alpha Parking Lot.....	11
7	Design Plans for Dickinson Stormwater Wetland.....	15
8	Image of Dickinson Design Plans (aerial view).....	16

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Pollutant Removal as Described by the U.S. E.P.A.....	4
2	Results of Stormwater BMP Literature Review.....	5
3	Stormwater BMP Sources.....	6
4	Plantings in the Dickinson Bioretention Area.....	8
5	Results of Water Quality Tests for the Storm of January 5, 2004.....	22
6	Results of Water Quality Tests of the February 3, 2004 Rainfall and Snowmelt Runoff.....	23
7	Results of Water Quality Tests of the February 6, 2004 Rainfall and Snowmelt Runoff.....	23
8	Removal Ratios.....	24

List of Exhibits

Exhibit		
1	Chemical Data Sheet.....	30

Chapter One: Background and Justification

Introduction

Managing stormwater runoff is an important aspect of ensuring the quality of our rivers, lakes and streams. Stormwater runoff replenishes our waterways. As the water flows over different types of surfaces it picks up particles, and chemicals that are sitting on the surface. Fertilizers, road salts and industrial pollutants are just a few of the things that can end up in streams this way. The variety of pollutants in urban stormwater runoff makes treatment very difficult. It is a mixture of many species of compounds that can change from season to season and during the storm (Sansalone, 2003)

The historical concern in stormwater management was to reduce downstream flooding. Little thought was given to the environmental impacts of practices geared towards quantity control. Quality of discharge has recently been added to the list of owner and operator responsibilities. The term ‘BMP’ (Best Management Practice) in relation to urban runoff was adopted in the 1970’s to represent control measures and practices that could be applied to reduce runoff volumes and contaminant concentrations. Currently, most BMPs are pollutant management containments, not treatment facilities (Hird 2003). Many published studies have documented the efficacy of stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) in removing pollutants (Schuler, 2000).

Stormwater BMPs can be divided into three major categories:

- Source controls, which are intended to intercept the polluted runoff before it enters the stream
- Treatment based controls, which physically, chemically or biologically treat the water using a structural device
- Hydraulic controls to divert flows away from source areas (Hird et al, 2003)

This report focuses on vegetated BMPs, such as:

1. Vegetated Swales— A vegetated swale is a grassed water conveyance channel that removes pollutants by filtering through grass and infiltration through soil.
2. Filter Strips— A filter strip is a vegetated strip of land that buffers a stream by accepting storm runoff as a sheet of overland flow and treating the water before releasing it to the receiving waters
3. Stormwater Wetlands— These can be man-made, natural, or modified natural. Pollutants are removed by sedimentation, plant uptake, sorption, infiltration, microbial decomposition, and ionic exchange (Field and Sullivan, 2003).

The BMPs under study are located on the University of Delaware campus in Newark, Delaware, mostly within the boundaries of the Experimental Watershed. Jennifer Campagnini created the Experimental Watershed in 2001 during an internship sponsored by the Delaware Water Resources Center. This report is part of phase three of the work within the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed. Tara Harrell conducted phase two in Spring 2002. Her report studied the link between land use and stream health. Judith Walker and Kristen Sentoff are also working on phase three by restoring Blue Hen Creek and Fairfield Run, two streams within the Experimental Watershed.

The Dickinson Bioretention area is behind the Dickinson Dormitories, along Hillside Drive. The Clayton Hall BMP is a manmade wetland and is located between Blue Hen Creek and Pencader Way. Figure 1 shows the locations of all BMPs on campus.

Retrofitting stormwater BMPs is currently considered as a restoration strategy in the Christina Basin of northern Delaware and southeastern Pennsylvania (Kauffman et al.). This technique is intended for restoring developed watersheds that generally have poor water quality due to high amounts of impervious surfaces, low forested and open spaces, and higher densities of contaminant sources.

As reported in the *Watershed Restoration Action Strategy for the Delaware Portion of the Christina Basin* the average grade for the Christina Basin is a 'C', with stream water quality receiving a 'B-', Stream Habitat receiving a 'C', and watershed health receiving a 'C'

(Kauffman 2003). The effort is to apply a restoration strategy in accordance with the Total Maximum Daily Loads under the Clean Water Act. This research is intended to gather information on the pollutant removal efficacy of the stormwater BMPs installed on the University of Delaware campus.

Objectives

Project objectives were to test the levels of pollutants in the inflows and outflows of several stormwater BMPs. The BMPs were mapped using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). Using test kits, pollutant removal efficacy was tested as a ratio of inflow to outflow. The research was conducted with the following approach:

1. Compile literature review
2. Field Survey Stormwater BMPs
3. Map the BMPs using GIS
4. Create Methods for collecting samples
5. Sample stormwater during appropriate rain events
6. Compute pollutant removal efficiency
7. Prepare Research Report

Study Area

The BMPs to be studied are situated on the University of Delaware Campus in Newark, Delaware. The Clayton Hall Stormwater Wetland is contained within the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed, established in 2001 by the UD Water Resources Agency. Student researchers selected the BMPs to be tested based on the following criteria.

1. Located on the University of Delaware campus.

Accessibility—The ability of researchers to get to the BMPs was a limiting

Chapter Two: Methodology

Literature Review

Researchers conducted a literature review of available stormwater management data. Tables 1 and 2 display the results of this literature review. Table 1 is adapted from a manual published by the U.S. E.P.A. The pollutants displayed here are those most often studied and having readily available information.

Table 1: Pollutant Removal Efficiency

BMP Type	Typical Pollutant Removal (percent)			
	Suspended Solids	Nitrogen	Phosphorus	Metals
Dry Detention Basins	30-65	15-45	15-45	15-45
Retention Basins	50-80	30-65	30-65	50-80
Constructed Wetlands	50-80	<30	15-45	50-80
Infiltration Basins	50-80	50-80	50-80	50-80
Infiltration Trenches/ Dry Wells	50-80	50-80	15-45	50-80
Porous Pavement	65-100	65-100	30-65	65-100
Grassed Swales	30-65	15-45	15-45	15-45
Vegetated Filter Strips	50-80	50-80	50-80	30-65
Surface Sand Filters	50-80	<30	50-80	50-80
Other Media Filters	65-100	15-45	<30	50-80

Source: U.S E.P.A, 1999

Table 2: Results of Stormwater BMP Literature Review

BMP Type	Description	Stormwater Treatment Median Pollutant Removal Percentage (parenthesis are first standard deviations where available)				
		Copper	Zinc	Sediment	Nitrate nitrogen	Phosphorus
Swale ²	A grassed stormwater conveyance channel that functions by allowing the water to filter through grass and infiltrate through the soil ³	51 (40) ²	715 (36) ²	81 (14) ²	31 (49) ²	34 (33) ²
Filter Strip 75 Feet ¹	Vegetated strips of land that act as a buffer. Accepts water as a sheet of overland flow. Low velocity flows, and vegetative cover enhance performance. ³	N/a	N/a	54 ¹	N/a	-25 ¹
Filter Strip 150 Feet ¹		N/a	N/a	84 ¹	N/a	20 ¹
Stormwater Wetlands	Remove pollutants through sedimentation, plant uptake, microbial decomposition, sorption, filtration and ion exchange. Efficacy can be increased by addition of a forebay, meandering flow, bottom benching and pondscaping with multiple species of plants ³	40 (45) ²	44 (40) ²	76 (43) ²	67 (54) ²	49 (36) ²
Dry detention ponds	Detain water for up to 48 hours. Adding a forebay can enhance performance. ³	26 ²	26 (37) ²	47 (32) ²	4 (23) ²	19 (13) ²
Wet Ponds	Contain a permanent pool of water for treating runoff. Offer better removal and less maintenance than dry ponds. Addition of a forebay, and/or the use of a fringe wetland can increase efficacy. ³	57(22) ²	66 (22) ²	80 (27) ²	43 (39) ²	51 (21) ²
Infiltration Trench	Shallow excavated trenches that are backfilled with stone to create an underground reservoir. Stormwater gradually exfiltrates from the trench into the soil. Clogging is the biggest problem. Grass filter strips can enhance performance. ³	N/a	N/a	N/a	42.3 ¹	100 ¹
Infiltration Basin	Similar to a dry pond except for the presence of an emergency spillway, and standard outlet structure. ³	N/a	N/a	75 ¹	55-60 ¹	60-70 ¹
Porous Pavement	Permeable, asphalt-concrete mix, which allows stormwater to percolate through the pavement into a deep gravel storage base, or into a piping system. ³	N/a	N/a	95 ^{1*}	82 ^{1*}	65 ^{1*}

¹Stormwater Center Fact Sheets

²Pennington, et al., 2003

³Field and Sullivan, 2003

* Data based on fewer than 5 data points

As a result of the literature review, student researchers compiled a list of sources concerning the study of stormwater Best Management Practices. Table 3 displays these sources.

Table 3: Stormwater BMP Sources

Reference	Author	Date	One Sentence Description
<u>The Practice of Watershed Protection</u>	Scheuler, Thomas R and Heather K. Holland	2000	A comprehensive book of techniques for protecting water quality. Detailed information about BMPs including case studies and published reports,
<u>Wet Weather flow in the Urban Watershed</u>	Field, Richard and Daniel Sullivan	2003	A compilation of 13 detailed studies of stormwater BMPs.
<u>Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Stormwater Best Management Practices.</u>	U.S. E.P.A.	1999	An extremely helpful guide to managing urban stormwater. Includes regulations, assessments of environmental problems associated with urban runoff, solutions and cost/benefit analysis.

Field Survey

During field sampling surveyed the areas around the Dickinson Bioretention Basin and the Clayton Stormwater wetland the BMPs in order to assess accessibility. The BMPs were then mapped using GIS software and the 2002 Delaware aerial images.

Figure 2 displays the Dickinson Bioretention Basin and the area immediately surrounding it. Figure 5 displays the Clayton Hall stormwater wetland and its surroundings.

Figure 1: Map of Stormwater Best Management Practices on and Adjacent to the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed.





Figure 2: Dickinson Dormitory Bioretention Area Map



In the summer of 2001 the University of Delaware Facilities Management built the Dickinson Stormwater wetland and then modified it in 2002. It was planted with a variety of wetland plants

for aesthetic value, wildlife habitat and pollutant removal. Table 4 provides a listing of the plants used in the Dickinson Bioretention Area.

Table 4: Plantings in the Dickinson Bioretention Area.

Dickinson Stormwater BMP List of Plantings	
Common Name	Botanical Name
River birch	Betula nigra
Sweet Gum	Liquidambar styraciflua 'Moraine'
Bald Cypress	Taxodium distichum
Northern Bayberry	Myrica pensylvanica
Chokeberry	Aronia arbutifolia 'brilliantissima'
Winterberry	Ilex verticillata
Iris	Iris siberica
Slender Rush	Juncus tenuis
Joe Pye Weed	Eupatorium purpureum
Cardinal Flower	Lovelia cardinalis
Goldenrod	Solidago graminifolia
Heavy Metal Switch Grass	Panicum virgatum

Source: Taylor, 2004

Figure 3: Dickinson Bioretention Wetland after Completion



Source: Taylor, 2004

Figure 4: Dickinson Bioretention Basin in the Rain



Source: Taylor 2004

Figure 5: Clayton Hall Stormwater Wetland Map




Figure 6: Image of Clayton Hall Stormwater Swale Running along the Alpha Sigma Alpha Parking Lot.



Sampling Methods

Researchers grabbed samples of stormwater runoff using the following methods

Dickinson Bioretention Basin

Task 1: Monitor rainfall totals as measured at the State Climatologist's office at Pearson Hall on the University of Delaware Main Campus.

Task 2: Grab samples at inflow and outflow sites. Inflowing water was collected in a glass collection jar as it ran off the adjacent Dickinson complex parking lot. Researchers modified a plastic graduated cylinder with fishing line to gather outflow water from the underground outflow pipe, accessible via an above ground grate.

Task 3: Return to UD WRA office to complete water quality tests, using Lamotte Student test kits.

Clayton Hall Stormwater Wetland

Task 1: Monitor rainfall totals as measured at the State Climatologist's office at Pearson Hall on the University of Delaware Main Campus.

Task 2: Grab samples at inflow and outflow sites. Collect inflowing water flowing in the swale running parallel to Blue Hen Creek and the Alpha Sigma Alpha parking lot. . Researchers modified a plastic graduated cylinder with fishing line to gather outflow water from BMP, collecting water as close to the outflow pipe as possible. Clogging of the outflow pipe presented a problem for sampling.

Task 3: Return to UD WRA office to complete water quality tests, using Lamotte Student test kits.

Analysis

Researchers analyzed the following pollutants in the inflow and outflow water:

- Temperature
- pH
- Ammonia
- Chloride
- Chlorine
- Copper
- Dissolved Oxygen
- Iron
- Nitrate
- Phosphate
- Conductivity


Water samples were collected in the field and then brought back to the UD WRA office and tested using the Lamotte Water Quality test kits. The kits contain test tablets that react with pollutants in water. Water is measured into a test tube and then the appropriate tablet is added. A color change occurs, and that color compared to a chart. It is in this manner that pollutant concentrations are determined.

Chapter Three: Results and Discussion

Dickinson Bioretention Area

The University of Delaware Facilities Management built this Bioretention basin in 2001. The original design of the wetland called for a sandy bottom. However the sand did not permit the wetland to drain fast enough, and in 2002 the sand was replaced with a layer of coarse gravel. It has a 0.5 feet ponding depth and a bottom surface area of 2,500 square feet, and is designed to hold runoff for a period of 24-48 hours. The original reason for building the wetland was to control the volume of flow, running off of the adjacent parking lot and surrounding field. (Taylor, 2004). Figures 7 and 8 display the installation plans for this wetland, including underground pipes.

Figure 7: Design Plans for Dickinson Stormwater Wetland.



Source: Taylor, 2004

Clayton Hall Stormwater Wetland

The University of Delaware Facilities Management constructed the Clayton Hall stormwater wetland in 1996 (Taylor, 2004). This wetland was not intensively planted—only river birch was manually planted. All other plants living in the wetland are volunteer, the predominant plant being multiflora rose. This thorny invasive species has spread from the nearby Blue Hen Creek (Taylor, personal communication). This wetland catches runoff from the University of Delaware's Laird Campus. This is entirely institutional land use. This type of land use has an imperviousness factor of 55% (Campagnini, 2001). Design Plans for this wetland were unavailable.

Pollutants of Urban Runoff

Given the areas in which these BMPs are located, they should be held accountable to the types of pollutants most often found in urban runoff. According to the U.S. E.P.A. Pollutants most commonly associated with urban runoff are:

- Suspended Solids
- Nitrogen
- Phosphorus
- Lead
- Zinc
- Copper
- Bacteria

The tests conducted were not sensitive to all of these pollutants but did test for important components of urban runoff. The sources of these pollutants are varied, but all have their origins in urban infrastructure. While these indicators are important, factors such as temperature and salinity must also be considered

Solids and Floatables

Solids are extremely common in urban stormwater. Solids come from many different sources- erosion of roadways, dust and litter. They contribute to the increased turbidity of water, which makes it difficult for sunlight to penetrate to the bottom of a pool of water. Water quality, wildlife habitat and aesthetic problems all follow from this issue. Settled sediments alter and can destroy fish habitat and bottom dwelling organisms. They also can play a role in holding pollutants in a water body by binding the particle to the solids' surface (U.S. E.P.A., 1999)

Oxygen Demanding Substances

Urban stormwater can contain many different types of living organisms that need oxygen to survive. It is important for the habitat quality of a receiving stream that the dissolved oxygen levels stay high enough to support a variety of fish and other aquatic organisms. Typically, levels are comparable to that of water being released from wastewater treatment facilities and therefore are not a concern. The levels of dissolved oxygen do become an issue when nutrient enrichment and the needs of bottom dwelling organisms are considered (U.S. E.P.A, 1999). It is here that our dissolved oxygen tests become important

Nitrogen and Phosphorus

Nitrogen and phosphorus are the main nutrients of concern when dealing with urban runoff. The major sources are fertilizers, detergents, plant debris, atmospheric deposition, old septic systems and animal wastes. When excess nutrients are in a water body, primary biological activity tends to increase, which causes excessive algal growth. Eutrophication and nuisance algal blooms can follow. A study conducted by the EPA between 1978 and 1983 concluded that nutrient levels found in urban runoff are high when compared to other possible discharges (U.S. E.P.A., 1999).

Ammonia

Ammonia is a source of Nitrogen. Typically it is non-toxic except at extremely high levels. Sources of this chemical can include animal wastes and cleaning products.

Chlorine

Chlorine is not naturally present in waters. High levels of this chemical can be toxic to aquatic life.

Chloride

Chlorides in urban runoff usually have their sources in road salting. High levels can be toxic to aquatic life

Metals

Metals found in urban stormwater are typically from automobiles and industry. Lead, copper and zinc are the most prevalent priority pollutant found in urban runoff (NURP qtd in U.S. EPA, 1999). Copper is usually found in industrial effluent, and on surfaces coming from the corrosion of pipes and fittings. Iron is present in most natural waterways. The most common sources are soil and rocks. It can also come from rusting automobiles. High levels are usually traced to industrial effluent (Campagnini, 2001)

Temperature

Water holds less oxygen as the temperature increases, therefore decreasing its ability to support life. As urban runoff flows over rooftops, parking lots and roadways, the water can be heated. If it then flows directly into a receiving body of water, the temperature will increase in that body and alter the spectrum of organisms able to live there. A study described in the August 1999 Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Stormwater Best Management Practices found that for every one percent increase in watershed imperviousness, base flow water temperature increased by 0.14 °F.

pH

Fish and other aquatic organisms are very sensitive to changes in pH. Urban areas tend to have higher pH levels in runoff due to the lack of a buffering capacity found in natural soils and landscapes. (U.S. E.P.A, 1999)

Pollutant Removal Methods

Stormwater BMPs use a variety of different methods to remove pollutants from urban runoff. The BMPs in this study used a combination of sedimentation, biological uptake, filtration, and infiltration.

Sedimentation

Gravitational settling is the major mechanism in ponds and constructed wetlands. Metals, hydrocarbons, nutrients and oxygen demanding substances can be adsorbed to particulate matter, especially clay soils. Sometimes a coagulant is needed for fine particulate matter (U.S. E.P.A, 1999).

Biological Uptake

Urban runoff typically contains significant amounts of nutrients. Aquatic plants, algae and microorganisms can use these nutrients for growth. If the plant matter is removed at the end of the growing season, then these nutrients can be permanently removed. However, if the plants are left to decompose in the BMP the nutrients can be re-released into the water column (U.S. E.P.A, 1999).

Filtration

When water is passed through a porous material such as soil, sand, gravel, peat or compost or a combination of materials particulates can be separated and therefore removed. However, the success of this removal practice depends upon a wide variety of variables such as particle shape, size and chemical charge and the velocity of the water (U.S. E.P.A, 1999).

Infiltration

Infiltration reduces the runoff volume discharged into receiving waters, making it the most effective way to control runoff. It also is an effective method of pollutant control, removing contaminants as water infiltrates into the ground (U.S. E.P.A, 1999).

Results

The results for both stormwater BMPs were mixed, making it difficult to draw any strong conclusions. Overall, the water collected from the inflowing runoff was free of the pollutants analyzed in this study. Ammonia, chlorine, and copper were never detected in inflowing water in either BMP.

Dickinson Bioretention Area

The results of the analysis of the inflowing and outflowing waters of the Dickinson Bioretention Area are as follows:

- Conductivity increased dramatically.
- Chlorides always increased
- Dissolved Oxygen stayed constant unless inflowing concentrations were high
- Iron was removed
- Phosphorus was detected in all outflowing concentrations, even when absent in inflowing waters. One possible explanation could be the occasional presence of waterfowl in the BMP. Another reason could be an internal production of phosphorus by microbes living in the BMP (Thomas et al, 2000)

Clayton Stormwater Wetland

The results of the analysis of the inflowing and outflowing waters collected at the Clayton Hal Stormwater Wetland are as follows:

- Conductivity in this BMP always increased.
- Chlorides were increased when inflowing concentrations were low but were slightly reduced in the other 2 samples.
- Dissolved Oxygen stayed level except in the instance where inflowing concentrations were low (2ppm), in which case the DO level increased.
- Iron addition was observed in one instance
- Phosphates were removed on one occasion, and remained untreated from another storm.

The following tables display the data collected on each storm event. Table 5 displays the results of the first analysis. Table 6 and Table 7 show the results of the water quality analysis of runoff

from a combination of rainwater runoff and snowmelt event. Pollutant loads in snowmelt are much higher than that of rain runoff (Hird et al, 2003). This can be attributed to the fact that snow tends to sit on the ground and gather pollutants from passing cars, atmospheric deposition and such. Also because the ground is frozen, not as much water infiltrates into the soil. Pollutants are then more likely to be carried into waterways by overland flow.

Table 5: Results of Water Quality Tests for the Storm of January 5, 2004

Parameter (ppm)	Dickinson 1/5/04			Clayton 1/5/04		
	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio
Temperature (°C)	12.0	11.0	8.4%	12.0	12.5	4.0%
PH	6.0	6.0	0.0%	6.0	6.0	0.0
Conductivity	50.0	470.0	-840.0%	400.0	750.0	-87.5%
Ammonia	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Chloride	-72.8	44.8	161.4%	25.2	123.2	-388.9%
Chlorine	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Copper	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Dissolved Oxygen	4.0	4.0	0.0%	3.0	3.0	0.0%
Iron	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Nitrate	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Phosphate	0.0	0.5	0.0%	0.5	0.0	100.0%
Time	12:00 PM	12:15 PM		12:30 PM	12:45 PM	

Table 6: Results of Water Quality Tests of the February 3, 2004 Rainfall and Snowmelt Runoff.

Parameter (ppm)	Dickinson 2/3/04			Clayton 2/3/04		
	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio
Temperature (°C)	8.0	8.0	0.0	6.0	6.5	-8.4
PH	5.5	6.0	-9.1	5.5	5.5	0.0
Conductivity	880.0	1990	-126.14%	1630.0	1540.0	5.4%
Ammonia	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Chloride	159.6	470.0	-194.74%	369.6	344.4	6.7%
Chlorine	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Copper	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Dissolved Oxygen	6.0	4.0	33.2%	2.0	6.0	-200.0%
Iron	1.0	0.0	100.0%	1.0	1.0	0.0%
Nitrate	0.0	2.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0	N/A
Phosphate	4.0	1.5	0.5%	0.0	0.0	N/A
Time	3:00 PM	3:00 PM		3:25 PM	3:30PM	

Table 7: Results of Water Quality Tests of the February 6, 2004 Rainfall and Snowmelt Runoff.

Parameter (ppm)	Dickinson 2/6/04			Clayton 2/6/04		
	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio	Inflow	Outflow	Removal Ratio
Temperature (°C)	11.0	10.0	9.1	11.0	10.0	9.1
PH	6.5	6.0	N/A	5.5	5.5	N/A
Conductivity	660.0	1990.0	-201.4%	450.0	290.0	35.6%
Ammonia	0.0	0.0	100%	0.0	0.0	N/A
Chloride	98.0	470.4	-380.0%	39.2	-5.6	114.3%
Chlorine	0.0	0.0	100.0%	0.0	0.0	N/A
Copper	0.0	0.0	100.0%	0.0	0.0	N/A
Dissolved Oxygen	2.0	2.0	100.0%	6.0	6.0	100.0%
Iron	1.0	0.0	100.0%	0.0	1.0	0%
Nitrate	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0	N/A
Phosphate	0.0	2.0	0.0%	1.0	1.0	100.0%
Time	12:45 PM	12:45 PM		1:10 PM	1:10 PM	

An expected result of the snowmelt runoff is the extreme spike in conductivity of the water, both inflowing and out flowing. It also seems that conductivity is increased as the water flows through

the BMP. This could be from the road salts in the runoff flowing into the wetland, concentrating in the BMP and then being flushed out by the incoming rainwater.

The results of the water quality tests were used to calculate pollutant removal percentages. Table 8 displays these percentages which were calculated using the following formula

$$\frac{(\text{Inflow Concentration} - \text{Outflow Concentration})}{\text{Inflow Concentration}} * 100 = \% \text{Removal}$$

Table 8: Removal Ratios

Parameter (ppm)	Dickinson ratios 1/5/04	Dickinson ratios 2/3/04	Dickinson ratios 2/6/04	Clayton ratios 1/5/04	Clayton ratios 2/3/04	Clayton ratios 2/6/04
Temperature	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PH	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Conductivity	-840.0%	-126.1%	-201.5%	-87.5%	5.5%	35.6%
Ammonia	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Chloride	161.5%	-194.7%	-380.0%	-388.9%	6.8%	114.3%
Chlorine	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Copper	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Dissolved Oxygen	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	N/D	-200.0%	0.0%
Iron	N/D	100.0%	100.0%	N/D	0.0%	0.0%
Nitrate	N/D	0.0%	0.0%	N/D	N/D	N/D
Phosphate	0.0%	62.5%	0.0%	N/D	0.0%	0.0%

N/D means that particular pollutant was not detected, and a negative removal ratio indicates addition by the BMP.

Chapter Four: Conclusions and Implications

1. Pollutant Removal Efficiencies

Overall, the water entering the wetlands is free of the pollutants analyzed in this study. When pollutants are present in the inflowing water, they are not removed with a high level of efficiency. Concerns are the additions of phosphorus in the Dickinson BMP, the presence of invasive plant species in the Clayton Hall BMP and the consistent increase in the conductivity of the water in both BMPs.

The Dickinson wetland consistently adds phosphorus to the out flowing water, except in the case of extremely high inflowing concentrations (table 2). This suggests that there is a background level of phosphorus in the BMP at all times. Also, nutrients could be coming from decomposing plant matter, as there is no end of season detritus removal schedule by the University of Delaware, or from microbes living in the BMP.

2. Maintenance

Both Stormwater BMPs are in need of cleaning. Regularly scheduled maintenance would aid in the performance of both wetlands.

This issue is addressed specifically in a published study conducted on an area known as Lake McCarrons. A researcher returned to a pond/ wetland system 12 years after conducting an initial study. The original study had been conducted during the first 2 years of the wetland's existence, and was very intense. The results indicated that the wetland was highly effective. In both winter and summer it functioned at 15-20% above the national average (Schueler et al, 2000).

Ten years later the system was again studied using the same sampling and testing techniques. Over that 10-year period the system had changed quite a bit, there were 100 new acres of drainage area added to the system, flow along the system had begun to channelize and the wetland species had been taken over by invasives. As a result of the lack of maintenance and upkeep of the system, performance declined drastically. The primary factor leading to the decline of the system results from the fact that the system became 'leaky', meaning that during base flow

conditions it would export pollutants, and not absorb as much as it used to during storm events. These results point to the importance of keeping up with the maintenance of stormwater wetlands (Schueler et al, 2000).

Currently plans are under way to clean out the outflow pipe at the Clayton wetland. The Dickinson Bioretention BMP does not have any planned maintenance schedule at this time (Taylor, 2004). A schedule may be needed to remove the decomposing vegetation. This alone could aid in the removal of phosphorus from the out flowing water.

3. Vegetation

The fact that the Clayton wetland was not planted with any vegetation except river birch leaves room for improvement. As observed in a study conducted in Maryland, over a period of years a ‘volunteer’ wetland in a Washington D.C. Business Park not planted with any species was overtaken by common reeds and cattails. A seasonal wetland observed in the study had an interesting growth pattern. Created in Queen Anne, Maryland it was originally planted with 4,000 individuals from 3 species. The planted species did very well, however the emergent zone was invaded by cattails and spike rush and other sedges. However, the entire wetland was not overtaken by these species (Schueler et al, 2000).

Both wetlands appeared to function very well, even though the Washington Business Park volunteer wetland presented some obstacles to testing. The Queen Anne Stormwater Wetland was extremely effective at removing Phosphorus and Suspended Solids. Perhaps most interesting is that this wetland’s plant community formed a “structural matrix” that was exploited by many other species (Schueler et al, 2000).

Currently the Clayton wetland is being taken over by multiflora rose. This invasive is extremely difficult to remove and a highly efficient invader of any open space. The Clayton wetland would benefit from some plantings of native perennial wetland plants. However adding plants must be followed by a maintenance schedule, as illustrated by the phosphorus problem found in the Dickinson Bioretention Basin.

Recommendations for the Future

Based on the research conducted during this study and the results of the tests conducted, I recommend that several tests be added to the methodology. To detect pollutants that are commonly found in urban stormwater. The additional tests would provide a more accurate portrait of how well the BMPs are functioning as well as a more complete picture of what is entering the BMPs. Testing should be added for:

- a. Suspended Solids
- b. Hydrocarbons
- c. Zinc
- d. Lead

Stormwater BMPs do help to remove pollutants from the water cycle. Those studied here are small in scale; other studies conducted on larger BMPs have shown to bring significant improvements to polluted water. All BMPs require several steps to keep them in working order:

1. Monitor the BMP immediately after installation—this allows for any temporal changes to be documented and keeps a running record of efficiency.
2. Develop a Maintenance Schedule—keeping the pipes clean and dead plant matter out of the system could be two of the most important aspects of BMP functionality. Without water flow stagnation can occur; flow over dead plant matter simply puts nutrients back into the system
3. Establish Suitable Vegetation—This provides soil stabilization, nutrient removal and prevents invasives from taking over the BMP.

The BMPs installed here appear to function below the average for pollution removal, but do provide flood and erosion control. The area where the Dickinson BMP is now located had very poor drainage prior to the installation of the BMP. After a rain the area was constantly under an inch of water. The Clayton Hall stormwater wetland diverts much rainwater from the eroded slopes of the Blue Hen Creek. While it does not do much for pollutant removal, it does help to maintain the integrity of the stream below. Additional care would only serve to improve the functions of these man made wetlands.

Chapter Five: References

Campagnini, Jennifer and Kauffmann, G. 2001. *Development of the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed Project*. University of Delaware, Pages 35-37.

Field, Richard and Daniel Sullivan. 2003. *Management of Wet Weather Flow in the Urban Watershed in Wet Weather Flow in the Urban Watershed: Technology and Management*.

Editors: Richard field and Daniel Sullivan. CRC Press. New York. Pages 1-37.

Harrell, Tara L. Spring 2002. *Linking Stream Health and Land Use in the University of Delaware Experimental Watershed*. University of Delaware, Pages 1-6.

Hird, Jonathan and John J Sansalone. 2003. *Treatment of Stormwater Runoff from Urban Pavement and Roadways in Wet Weather Flow in the Urban Watershed: Technology and Management*. Editors: Richard field and Daniel Sullivan. CRC Press. New York. Pages 141-182.

Kauffmann, Gerald J., Sara L. Wozniak, Kevin J. Vonck. June 2003 *A Watershed Restoration Action Strategy for the Delaware Portion of the Christian Basin*. University of Delaware. Pages 32-39.

Pennington, Stephen R, Michael D. Kaplowitz, Scott B. Witter. (October 2003) *Re-examining Best Management Practices for Improving Water Quality in Urban Watersheds*. Journal of the American Water resources Association. Vol 39, Pages 1027-1042.

Sansalone, John J. 2003 *The Physical and Chemical nature of Urban Stormwater Runoff Pollutants in Wet Weather Flow in the Urban Watershed: Technology and Management*. Editors: Richard field and Daniel Sullivan. CRC Press. New York. Pages 43-63.

Stormwater Management Fact Sheets .<http://www.stormwatercenter.net/> 2/24/04.

Taylor, Tom. "RE: dates??" E-mail to Kathleen Cormier. Feb 16, 2004.

Taylor, Tom. September 2002. CD-ROM. *Biofiltration/Bioretenention Systems: University of Delaware* .

U.S. E.P.A. August 1999. *Preliminary Data summary of Urban Storm Water Best Management Practices*. Office of Water, Washington, D.C. Pages (4-1)-(4-49), (5-23)-(5-84).

Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Chemical Data Sheet

Chemical Data Sheet

Date: _____ Recorder: _____ Time: _____

Site Number: _____ Temperature: _____

BMP

Location/ Number: _____ pH _____

Parameter	Results	Comments/Grade
Ammonia		
Chloride		
Chlorine		
Copper		
Dissolved Oxygen*		
Iron		
Nitrate		
Conductivity		
Phosphate		