

Drainage Capacity Management



Analysis of SWM Controls to Meet Multiple Drainage Criteria

By: Edward Graham, M.A.Sc.Eng., P.Eng. egraham@civi.ca And

Joshua Wagemaker, B.Eng., EIT jwagemaker@civi.ca

November 26, 2019 www.civi.ca

Introduction: MECP Regulation



- On August 14 2019, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, posted a notice in the Environmental Registry of Ontario about their decision to introduce a <u>new regulation</u> under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA).
- The new regulation is called "Environmental Compliance Regulation in Respect of Sewage Works" (Ontario Regulation 208/19).
- The regulation is to enable prescribed persons to make alterations to sanitary collection and stormwater systems.



- A new 'Design Criteria Document' is being developed, to be satisfied together with the conditions in the municipal wide consolidated permission for stormwater, sometimes called the Area-Wide Linear Infrastructure ECA.
- "Pre-authorized" projects will be removed from requiring ministry approval.
- Ministry also wants to provide some flexibility for retrofits and to promote the use of new Low-Impact-Development (LID) techniques.



- As of August 2019, the new Design Criteria Document to be followed covers:
 - Water Balance
 - Water Quality
 - Erosion Control
 - Water Quantity
 - Flood Control
 - Construction Erosion & Sediment Control
 - Monitoring



- This presentation provides an example of how a municipality can plan and manage new and existing stormwater drainage infrastructure to meet stormwater management criteria, such as the new MECP criteria, and other Provincial and Conservation Authority regulations.
- Specifically, it presents the process and tools to manage new development areas and SWM controls.





Step 1: Technical Direction

Relevant Policies, Studies, and Regulatory Guidelines

- Provincial Plans
- Provincial and Conservation Authority Guidelines
- Official Plans
- Watershed/Subwatershed Plans
- Source Water Protection Programs
- Previously Completed Technical Studies





Step 2: Characterization



Physical Features and Functions

- Existing Drainage Infrastructure
- Natural Heritage
- Soil Conditions
- Geomorphology
- Groundwater Resources
- Surface Water Features and Systems





Step 3: Identify Extents of Study Area

Study Area Includes:

- Existing Settlement Area
- Future Settlement Area Expansion
- Adjacent Lands Contributing
 Stormwater Drainage
- Permanent and Intermittent Streams

Legend



Settlement Area Reserve Boundary



Built Boundary



ve Boundary Stormwater Drainage Areas

Outflow





Step 4: Define Area Drainage Features

Study Area Includes Existing:

- Watercourses
- SWM Controls
- Subcatchments
- & Proposed:
- Future Land Use Areas

Legend

- ----- Delineated Watercourse
 - Stormwater Management Facilities

Storm Sewer System





Future Development





Model Parameterization

Infiltration Loss Method

- Modified SCS Curve Method (CN & IA)
- Horton's Equation Method (F_o, F_c, F, K)





Scenario1 ×	Calculate Area Weighte	ed Parameter		scenario1 X	Calculate CN			x	
Schematic Map	Selected Commands:	59		Schematic Map	Selected Command	s: 16			Ψ
B Map5	Parameter to Calculate:	la		⊟ ≝ Map5	Soil Layer:	SOILNAD ~	Land Use Layer:	TRCANAD84	
Operation	s Source Layer:	TRCANAD84			Soil Group Field:	MAPUNIT	Land Use Field:	Landuse_Fu ~	
🗉 🗌 SWM Pon	Course Fields	Landers D.		E SWM Ponds f	Manning		Manning:	TRCA	
Routes	Source Field:	Lanouse_ru		Routes				11001	
B S Hydrolog	Field Mapping:			Hydrographs	Value	Mapped Value	Value	Mapped Value	
	value	Number	the start have	🕀 🗌 NasHyd	ONOND012Bes	C * *	Agricultural	Farm 👻 📩	
🗈 🗌 ScsHy	d Agricultural	7		⊞ 🔲 ScsHyd	ONOND012Bg	. v]	Airport	[Communited w]	
E Standi	Airport	2				A		Commercial	
Utility	Reach/Rhiff			E Utility	ONOND012Bis	A *	Beach/Bluff	Natural *	
	Camatan	0		E D LID	ONOND0128	B ~	Cemetery	Cemetery *	
OpenStree	d -	5	- OX - STOR 5	OpenStreetMa	ONOND0128L	c v	Commercial	Commercial	
🗉 🗌 Subcatche	r Commercial	2		E Subcatchmen		-		Commercial	
SOILNAD	Estate Residential	2		SOILNAD	UNUNDU12Bos	8 ~	Estate Kesiden	Estate Residential	
E M INCANAL	Forest	10			ONOND012Brsl	A *	Forest	Conservation Lands *	North Ale
	Golf Course	5			ONOND012Brsl/	A *	Golf Course	Golf Course v	
	High Density Resident	tial 2			ONOND012Bs	8 ~	High Density R	Residential High 🗸	THE STATE
	Industrial	2			ONOND0128sl	8 ~	Industrial	Industrial v	
	Institutional	2	The states and the st		ONOND012Car		Institutional		
	Lacustrine	0	- HARRING AND		ONONDOTZCAL	C Y	Institutional	Institutional *	
	Erred Inc.		The second second		ONOND012Chc	C * *	Lacustrine	Water * *	
	Export Impo	ort Update Update	use state		Export	Import Clear CN Lookup	Table	Upda CN Cancel	
	500		A AL IN BUCK LIVE.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ME	
	× 600	0000 07110 V. 4004047 31704	>		X 605	2831 07028 V: 4864230 60601			,
× .	× 608	537371112 1: 400434731704			· · · · · ·				

Model Parameterization

Percent Impervious

- Total Percent Impervious (TIMP)
- Directly Connected Percent Impervious (XIMP)











Model Parameterization

Time to Peak (TP)

- **Upland's Method**
- Airport Method (T_c) , TP = 0.67xT_c
- Bransby-William's (T_c)

Channel Properties

- Length
- Slope
- Roughness (n)
- **Cross Section**

Reservoir Properties

- Storage
- Discharge



0.000

2 1.000

3 1.500 4 2.000

5 3.500

6 4.500

6.000

OK



Step 6: Input Modelling Data



Continuous Climate Data





Step 6: Input Modelling Data

Design Storms



17

Step 6: Input Modelling Data

Water Quality Modelling Data

Calculate GIS Land Use Percentage for Each Subcatchment Assign Standard TSS and TP EMC Values to Each Land Use





Land Cover	Percent	Area(ha)
Aggregate Extra	0.000	0.000
Agricultural	0.000	0.000
Airport	0.000	0.000
Beach/Bluff	0.000	0.000
Cemetery	0.000	0.000
Commercial	1.700	1.682
Estate Residentia	0.881	0.871
Forest	2.204	2.181
Golf Course	0.000	0.000
High Density Re:	0.000	0.000
Industrial	0.000	0.000
Institutional	4.315	4.270
Lacustrine	0.518	0.513
Landfill	0.000	0.000
Meadow	5.493	5.436
Medium Density	70.549	69.809
Mixed Commerc	0.000	0.000
Railway	0.000	0.000
Recreational/Op	11.436	11.316
Riverine	0.000	0.000
Roads	1.642	1.624
Rural Residentia	0.916	0.907
Successional For	0.000	0.000
Vacant Land	0.000	0.000
Wetland	0.346	0.343
otal	100	98.95

and Use

Land Cover	TSS	TP
Land Cover	(mg/l)	(mg/l)
Aggregate Extraction	177	0.33
Agricultural	100	0.23
Airport	201	0.25
Beach/Bluff	0	0
Cemetery	176	0.13
Commercial	201	0.25
Estate Residential	132	0.4
Forest	55	0.23
Golf Course	100	0.32
High Density Residential	132	0.4
ndustrial	177	0.33
nstitutional	91	0.21
Lacustrine	0	0
Landfill	177	0.33
Meadow	55	0.23
Medium Density Residential	132	0.4
Mixed Commercial Entertainment	201	0.25
Railway	114	0.43
Recreational/Open Space	27	0.2
Riverine	0	0
Roads	90	0.23
Rural Residential	132	0.4
Successional Forest	55	0.23
√acant Land	27	0.2
Wetland	13	0.81





Step 7: Analysis of Existing Conditions Pre-Development

External Drainage Area 1: Area: 17.12 ha Land Use: Agriculture

External Drainage Area 2: Area: 18.39 ha Land Use: Medium Density Residential

Pre-Development Area: Area: 12.95 ha Land Use: Vacant Land/ Open Space





Step 8: Analysis of Future Conditions

Post-Development

General Residential = 4.74 ha Roofs = 4.28 ha Roads = 1.76 ha Park = 0.74 ha Channel = 0.63 ha Propos Pond Block = 0.80 ha

174 Proposed Houses





Step 9: Scenario Comparison



Three Models Required for Further Analysis



Step 10: Water Balance



Continuous Simulation of Existing and Future Conditions Models

Manage the Recharge to Meet Predevelopment Conditions



Water Balance Targets

	Groundwater Recharge							
Year Pre-Development (m		Pre-Development (m³)	Post- Development (m ³) Target (
	2014	19035	7510	11525				
	2015	19165	6475	12690				
	2016	24862	8028	16834				
	Average	21021	7338	13683				



Step 10: Water Balance

Develop Mitigation Strategy

Assumptions:

- 1. Each roof is approximately 250 m².
- 2. Half of roof is routed to soakaway pit.
- 3. Each soakaway pit is 19.5 m² and 0.5 m deep.







Step 10: Water Balance

Implement Mitigation

Results:

Infiltration/Soakaway Pit = 80 m³ Target = 13,683 m³ # of Soakaway Pits = 13,683m³/80m³

171 Soakaway Pits or Approximately 1 Soakaway Pit Per House to Achieve Infiltration Targets

Recharge has been managed to meet predevelopment conditions.



Step 11: Erosion Control



Single Event Simulation and Continuous Simulation

Follow the water balance assessments completed in local watershed studies, MESPs, Class EAs, and geomorphological erosion assessments;

<u>OR</u>

Manage the 90th percentile storm (25 mm);

<u>OR</u>

Detain 25 mm over 24 to 48 hours.

Step 11: Erosion Control



Watercourse Erosion Analysis – Geomorphic Assessment

Threshold analysis establishes a depth, velocity, and discharge at which sediment of a particular size may potentially be entrained.

Two Phase Process:

- Phase I Characterization
- Phase II Erosion Analysis



CIVICA Water Management Solutions

Step 11: Erosion Control

Phase I – Characterization

- Conducted by P.Eng or P.Geo
- The purpose of erosion threshold analysis is to determine the flow rate required to entrain and transport channel/bank material.



Step 11: Erosion Control

Phase II – Erosion Analysis

A hydrologic model to assess in-stream erosion potential was created:

- Run existing conditions scenario to obtain targets
- Run future scenario with and without SWM controls
- Determine necessary LIDs and attenuation to maintain existing erosion potential
- A critical discharge rate of 0.07 m³/s was calculated based on the critical shear stress obtained from geomorphic assessment





Step 11: Erosion Control

Erosion Threshold Analysis Continuous Simulation

Erosion Index Results

Scenario	Maximum Erosion Index	Average Erosion Index	
Post-Development (Without Controls)	1056.54	588.94	
Post-Development (With Controls)	533.94	303.34	
Pre-Development (Existing Conditions)	677.87	389.16	Index
			Erosion





Step 12: Water Quantity

Single Event Simulation

Control post-development peak flows to pre-development levels for all storms up to and including the 100-year storm (i.e. 2, 5, 10, 50, and 100-year). ✓

<u>OR</u>

Development outside of the approved urban boundary when the hydrology study was finalized may require Regional storm protection, proponents should consult with the local conservation authority to confirm.



Step 12: Water Quantity

Sizing of Stormwater Management Pond

- SWM pond discharge-storage curve was iterated until the outlet hydrographs from existing and future conditions models were matched.
- This process was completed for all design storms.
- Water quantity targets were achieved for each design storm including the 25 mm event.





Step 12: Water Quantity

Single Event Analysis of Design Storms

Single-Event Analysis of Peak Flows

Design Storm	Existing Conditions	Future Conditions	% Difference	
	Target Peak Flow (m /s)	Achieved Peak Flow (m /s)		
25 mm	0.91	0.84	5.49	
2-Year	1.40	1.30	4.83	
5-Year	2.24	2.11	3.94	
10-Year	2.75	2.61	3.52	
25-Year	3.61	3.52	1.66	
50-Year	4.23	4.19	0.60	
100-Year	4.86	4.76	1.31	





Step 13: Water Quality Single Event & Continuous Simulations

- Manage the 90th percentile storm (25 mm) and 80% Total Suspended Solids removal over the catchment as per Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) particle size distribution.
- Evaluate the anticipated changes in phosphorous loadings (TP) between existing and future conditions (analysis of pre-development versus post-development without controls).
- Demonstrate how post-development TP will be minimized. Target of 80% TP removal for major development.



Step 13: Water Quality Single Event

25 mm Event Statistics				
Scenario TSS (kg) TP (kg)				
Pre-Development	14.507	0.107		
Post-Development No Controls	212.268	0.716		
Post-Development with Controls	36.541	0.142		

Based on the combined removal efficiency from the SWM pond and the soakaway pits, the model achieved: 83 % TSS Removal

80 % TP Removal



Roof Drainage



Step 13: Water Quality Continuous Simulation

Continous Simulation Statistics (2014-2016)					
Scenario TSS (kg) TP (kg)					
Pre-Development	1326.02	9.82			
Post-Development No Controls	16306.05	55.18			
Post-Development with Controls	2904.91	11.28			

Based on the combined removal efficiency from the SWM pond and the soakaway pits, the model achieved: 82 % TSS Removal

80 % TP Removal



Conclusions



- Stormwater Management Criteria can be met with a combination of LIDs and traditional SWM controls (e.g. Ponds).
- Analysis tools are available to help manage runoff (evaluate and design facilities).
- Management involves a treatment train of measures. These can be assessed with varying configurations to match site constraints.



Questions

