What's New with the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual?

Date:









What is the "Blue Book"?

Design manual for designers, developers, planners, government officials, and other stormwater practitioners to design Best Management Practices:

- Volume 1: Stormwater Policy Guidebook A policy document design to provide guidance on the basic principles of effective stormwater management for Georgia communities.
- Volume 2: Technical Handbook A technical handbook for design professionals on sustainable site design and stormwater management practices for land development.
- Volume 3: Pollution Prevention Guidebook a compendium of stormwater pollution prevention practices for use by local jurisdictions, businesses and industry, and local citizens.



Brief Background

- Why update the "Blue Book"?
 - Original GSMM ~ 15 yrs. old
 - New and Better Information
 - Approaches have Changed
 - State Water Plan Update
 - Stakeholder Request





What are the Major Changes?

- Comprehensive Stormwater Management Approach
- Recommended Runoff Reduction Performance Standard
- Revised Better Site Design Credits
- New Format
- Additional Details/Corrections





What are the Major Changes?

- New/Updated BMP Sections
- Digital Design Details
- Operations & Maintenance Guidance Document
- Landscaping & Aesthetics Guide
- Revised BMP Calculator Tool
- Corrected Technical Errors with New Information





Comprehensive Stormwater Management Approach

Communities are encouraged to apply:

- Natural Resource Inventory
- Green Infrastructure (GI)
- Low Impact Development (LID)
- Better Site Design (BSD)
- Runoff Reduction





Comprehensive Stormwater Management Approach (cont'd)

Runoff reduction:

- Reduces post-construction stormwater runoff rates, volumes, and pollutant loads
- Reduces risk of flooding
- Eliminates stormwater runoff from a given volume (and the pollutants associated with it), rather than just treating and/or detaining runoff
- Provides economic benefits (additional jobs, increased property values, etc.)
- Maintains, mimics or replaces landscape hydrologic functions





Previous Performance Standards

 Regulated MS4 communities are required to adopt the performance standards listed in their permit.





GSMM Coastal Stormwater Supplement (CSS) Performance Standards

Site Planning and Design Criteria

- Criteria #1: Natural Resources Inventory Criteria #2: Use of Green Infrastructure Practices Criteria #3: Stormwater Management Concept Plan Criteria #4: Stormwater Management Plan Criteria #5: Downstream Analysis Criteria #6: Stormwater Management System Inspection and Maintenance Plan Criteria #7: Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Criteria #8: Landscaping Plan
- Criteria #9: Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Post-Construction Stormwater Management Criteria

Criteria #1: Stormwater Runoff Reduction Criteria #2: Stormwater Quality Protection Criteria #3: Aquatic Resource Protection Criteria #4: Overbank Flood Protection Criteria #5: Extreme Flood Protection

Special Stormwater Management and Site Planning and Design Criteria (Shellfish harvesting areas) Criteria #1: Increased Stormwater Runoff Reduction Criteria #2: Enhanced Aquatic Resource Protection



GSMM Coastal Stormwater Supplement (CSS) Performance Standards

Runoff reduction of the 1.2-inch rainfall event

Post-Construction Stormwater Management Criteria

Criteria #1: Stormwater Runoff Reduction Criteria #2: Stormwater Quality Protection Criteria #3: Aquatic Resource Protection Criteria #4: Overbank Flood Protection Criteria #5: Extreme Flood Protection

If any of the stormwater runoff generated by the 1.2 inch storm event cannot be reduced on a development site, reduce TSS load by at least 80% and reduce nitrogen and bacteria loads to the *maximum extent practical*.



Previous GSMM WQ Performance Standard

- Only looked at TSS removal
- Did not account for the benefits of runoff reduction
- Did not coincide with the CSS



(Source: Center for Watershed Protection)



(Source: City of Atlanta)





- While regulated MS4 communities do have to adopt the Blue Book, it provides recommended, not required, performance standards
- Includes a runoff reduction standard and a water quality treatment standard



The following twelve (12) standards are recommended performance requirements for new development or redevelopment sites:

- Standard #1 Natural Resource Inventory
- Standard #2 Better Site Design Practices for Stormwater Management
- Standard #3 Runoff Reduction
- Standard #4 Water Quality
- Standard #5 Stream Channel Protection
- Standard #6 Overbank Flood Protection
- Standard #7 Extreme Flood Protection
- Standard #8 Downstream Analysis
- Standard #9 Construction Erosion and Sedimentation Control
- Standard#10 Stormwater Management System Operation and Maintenance
- Standard #11 Pollution Prevention
- Standard #12 Stormwater Management Site Plan





Standard #3 – Runoff Reduction

Runoff reduction practices should be sized and designed to retain the first 1.0 inch of rainfall on the site to the maximum extent practicable.

Standard #4 – Water Quality

Stormwater management systems should be designed to retain or treat the runoff from 85% of the storms that occur in an average year [1.2 inches], and reduce average annual post-development total suspended solids loadings by 80%.



Standard #3 – Runoff Reduction

- Runoff reduction practices should be sized and designed to retain the first 1.0 inch of rainfall on the site, or to the maximum extent practicable.
- This standard is quantified and expressed in terms of engineering design criteria through the specification of the runoff reduction volume (RR_v).
- Runoff reduction practices inherently reduce TSS and other pollutants to provide water quality treatment (i.e. 100% pollutant removal for stormwater retention, infiltration, evaporation, transpiration, or rainwater harvesting and reuse).
- If the entire 1.0-inch runoff reduction standard cannot be achieved, the remaining runoff from the 1.2-inch rainfall event must be treated by BMPs to remove at least 80% of the calculated average annual post-development TSS loading from the site per Standard #4 Water Quality.

Standard #4 – Water Quality

- Stormwater runoff generated on the development site shall be retained and/or treated by BMPs to <u>remove at least 80% of the calculated average annual post-development total suspended solids</u> (TSS) loading from the site.
- This standard is quantified and expressed in terms of engineering design criteria through the specification of the water quality volume (WQ_v), which is equal to the <u>runoff generated on a site from 1.2 inches of rainfall</u>.
- This can be achieved through the use of BMPs that provide runoff reduction or BMPs that provide treatment.





Figure 2.2.3-1 Representation of the Unified Stormwater Sizing Criteria

Given that an 80% TSS removal rate for the 1.2 inch rainfall event is the standard for addressing water quality, 100% TSS removal through volume reduction of the 1.0 inch rainfall event will address the same requirement. In another method of describing total TSS removal, 80% of 1.2 inches (0.96) approximately equates to 100% of 1.0 inches.







Better Site Design Credits

Better Site Design aims to protect and conserve natural areas, reduce impervious cover, and integrate stormwater management with site design.

- Five previous credits intended to be a bonus, but they go above and beyond what math and science say.
- More and better science is available to calculate benefits of new BMPs and runoff reduction practices.
- The following credits were removed:
 - Stream Buffers
 - Grass Channel
 - Overland Flow Infiltration and Groundwater Recharge
 - Environmentally Sensitive Large Lot Subdivisions
- Only remaining credit
 - Natural Area Conservation Credit





Natural Conservation Area Credit

- Subtract conservation areas from total site area when computing water quality and runoff reduction volume requirements.
- An added benefit will be that the post-development peak discharges will be smaller, and hence water quantity control volumes (CP_v, Q_{p25}, and Q_f) will be reduced due to lower post-development curve numbers.







Other Credits

- Site Reforestation/Revegetation
 - Subtract 50% of any reforested/revegetated areas from the total site area and re-calculate the runoff reduction volume (RR_v) and water quality volume (WQ_v) that applies to the development site.

Soil Restoration

- Subtract 50% of any restored pervious areas from the total site area and re-calculate the RR_v and WQ_v that applies to the development site.
- Site Reforestation/Revegetation & Soil Restoration
 - Subtract 100% of any reforested/revegetated and restored pervious areas from the total site area and re-calculate the RR_v and WQ_v that applies to the development site.



New Additions for Volume 1

- Discussion of Low Impact Development (Sect.1.5)
- Complete overhaul of Better Site Design chapter more concrete guidance for local governments (Chap. 3)
- Discussion of site plan review (Sect. 4.3)
- Different development types (Sect. 4.4)
- Revised operation and maintenance discussion (Sect. 5.2)
- Funding alternatives for local governments (Sect. 5.5)
- Alternatives to on-site stormwater management (Sect. 5.7)





zoning process.

Manual for Michigan highlights the following principles and key components of an LID design Plan first. To minimize stormwater impacts. stormwater management and UD should be approach integrated into the community planning and

tion approaches. Low Impact Development is more than an alter-Key Principles for LID native set of stormwater BMPs. LID can best be achieved if viewed in the context of the larger design process. The Low Impact Development

and reduce the stormwater impacts of the See Section 3.31 and Section 3.32 for more information on community- and site-level conserva-

encourage preferable types of development. for example, cluster developments, conservation subdivisions, city centers and conservation easements, which will allow more of the land area to be left in a natural state

allow the community to choose where and how densely development should (and should not) occur, or where redevelopment will be Establish legal mechanisms and incentives to

 Identify flood prone areas in the community and address them by acquiring floodplain and autoreas them by anyouring incorport in these properties, restricting development in these watersheds, or requiring runoff volume reduction or greater stormwater detention in Prepare comprehensive plans and zoning that

Detailed discussion of LID

systems. LID includes careful

ptection of a site's natural

e integrated into the

not only provides

ent design. The result

It greatly improves

infrastructure.

fits of LID. LID

other

r management

mic benefits

hese other

Pent

ation of

important element of LID is directing runoff to BMPs as close to the generation point as possible, in patterns that are decentralized and broadly distributed across the site.

the water cycle through careful control of peak rates as well as the volume of runoff and groundwater recharge, while protecting Water quality. UD reflects an appreciation for waver quarry, Lill renews an appression or management of both the largest storms, as well as the much more frequent, smaller storms. Disconnect. Decentralize. Distribute. An

 Mimic the natural water cycle. Stormwater supply, and recreation. management using UD includes mimicking

design process enables us to move away from the conventional concept of runoff as a disposal problem (and disposed of as rapidly as possible) to understanding that stormwater is a resource for groundwater recharge, stream a resource for groundwater rectarge, sites base flow, lake and wetland health, Water

 Manage stormwater as a resource — not a waste. Approaching LID as part of a larger

Introduction Prevent. Then mitigate. A primary goal of LID is preventing stormwater runoff by incorporating nonstructural practices into the site development process. This can ane sine ververiverine in process, it instant include preserving natural features, dustering encourse of cases young transient reason case and minimizing impervious surfaces. Once prevention as a design strategy is maximized, then the site design - using structural BMPs – can be prepared. Minimize disturbance. Limiting the disturbance of a site reduces the amount of stormwater runoff control needed to maintain the natural

> addced irrigation demands improve water supply reliability.

TIES

trees and other vegetative amenities ease property values.

As described in several of the studies ighlighted below, incorporating LID into a design can decrease overall stormwater

 Minimizing impervious cover reduces the cost of infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, streets, etc.).

 Preserving natural features and vegetation reduces the cost of land clearing and grading.

DEVELOPERS

 Treating stormwater runoff close to its source with a distributed system may reduce nuisance

 Directing stormwater runolf to vegetated areas and utilizing native plants reduces irrigation needs.

 Preserved mature trees can shade homes, which can reduce air conditioning needs and energy costs.

Other Environmental, Economic, and Social Benefits of Implementing LID In addition to the significant stormwater and water quality benefits (reduced stormwater pollutant levels, improved aquatic biodiversity, increased stream base flows, groundwater recharge, reduced flooding, etc), implementation of LID strategies can provide many additional direct and indirect benefits for homeowners, developers, and communities. HOME OWNERS

Reduced impervious cover and increased

Infiltrating LID BMPs contribute to groundwater

evaporative cooling decreases the urban heat

Runoff reduction decreases the magnitude and

frequency of combined sewer overflow events.

Cost issues are among the main objections to

implementing LID. However, many studies have

and BMPs can be more cost effective than more

conventional stormwater management approach-

es. The list below includes case studies, research,

recommendations, and site specific costs for

"Case Studies Analyzing the Economic Benefits

of Low Impact Development and Green

Infrastructure Programs" (US EPA, 2013) -

This report seeks to educate stormwater

professionals on the potential benefits of

UD and Green Infrastructure (GI) programs

of communities around the country. http://

water.epa.gov/polwaste/green/upload/lid-gi-

"Reducing Stormwater Costs through Low Impact

programs_report_8-6-13_combined.pdf

Development (LID) Strategies and Practices*

(US EPA, 2007) – This document summarizes

of LID methods to the costs of conventional

development methods. In many cases, the LID

seventeen (17) case studies comparing the costs

using thirteen (13) case studies from a variety

implementing LID:

shown that properly applied LID approaches

Cost Effectiveness of LID



Several Better Site Design case studies included in Ch. 3

Key considerations are highlighted

Fox Hollow Development - James Island, SC

Located on James Island, South Carolina, Fox Hollow is a 2.65 acre low impact development that protected the trees, wetlands, and topography of the site. Unlike conventional development, where mass grading is common, at Fox Hollow the land has been highly conserved – only enough land for the 9 houses and roadway were cleared. Narrow streets and driveways reduce impervious cover in the development. Rather than relying on pipes, a bioswale system conveys stormwater and bioreten-tion cells replace stormwater ponds. The site has a density of 4.22 homes/acre with 0.52 acres of open space consisting of park, bioretention and wetlands. Named "Best New Community of 2013" by the Charleston Homebuilders Association, Fox Hollow was specifically recognized for its low impact development approach (Ellis et al. 2014).



Figure 3.3-12 Site plan for Fox Hollow (Ellis et al, 2014)

Elements of Stormwater Management Programs

5.5 Funding

Description: Adequate funding is an essential part of a stormwater management program. While General Fund monies may be the most common funding approach, many other effective strategies exist.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- Funding strategies covered in this section include:
- General Fund
- Stormwater Utilities
- · Grant and Loan Programs
- » Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)
- » Section 319(h) Georgia's Nonpoint Source Implementation Grant
- » Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Water First
- » National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS)
- » Coastal Incentive Grant (CIG) Program
- Other Funding Sources
- » General Obligations Bonds
- » Development Impact Fees
- » Special Assessments/Tax Districts



Funding alternatives section



BMP Changes/Updates

- Updated existing BMP sections to current industry standards
- Included all CSS BMPs in (Vol. 2, Sect. 4)
- Added new BMP sections
 - Bioslope
 - Dry Extended Detention Basin (broken out from Dry Detention Bbasin section)
 - Regenerative Stormwater Conveyance
 - Porous Asphalt
- Removed BMP sections
 - Alum Treatment Systems
 - Rain Garden (incorporated in bioretention)









Bioslope

- Linear BMP that treats stormwater along an impervious area (such as roads, parking lots, etc.)
- Used to treat runoff close to the source



- Improves water quality by removing TSS, Phosphorus, Nitrogen, Fecal Coliform, and Metals
- Uses special permeable engineered soils to promote infiltration of water



Dry Extended Detention Basin

- Surface storage basin designed to provide water quality treatment
- Differ from dry detention basins by providing 24-hour detention of the channel protection volume



- Contributes to a sites overall perviousness and aesthetics
- Can be used for multiple purposes such as landscaped or recreational areas
- Improves water quality by removing TSS, Phosphorus, Nitrogen, Coliform, and Metals



Regenerative Stormwater Conveyance

- Provides treatment and conveyance through the combination of riffles, pools, vegetation, sand, and wood chips
- Designed to restore incised and eroded channels, ditches, and intermittent (ephemeral) streams



- Ideal in situation where the slope is greater than 5%
- When designed correctly, RSCs are safe, aesthetically pleasing, and may increase the natural value of the site



Porous Asphalt

- Increases void spaces to allow water to infiltrate into the subsoil below the paved surface
- Intended for low-traffic areas, or residential overflow parking applications



- Potential high failure rate if not adequately maintained or used in unstabilized areas
- Improves water quality by removing TSS, Phosphorus, Nitrogen, Metals, Coliform



4.2 Bioretention Areas



Description: Shallow stormwater basin or landscaped area that utilizes engineered soils or native, well-draining soil and vegetation to capture and treat runoff.

LID/GI Consideration: Low land requirement, adaptable to many situations, and often a small BMP used to treat runoff close to the source.

> Added LID/GI Considerations

New landscape format to make easier to read

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

DESIGN CRITERIA

- Maximum contributing drainage area of 5 acres
- Treatment area consists of ponding area, organic/mulch layer, planting media, and vegetation
- Requires landscaping plan
- Standing water has a maximum drain time of 24 hours
- · Pretreatment recommended to prevent clogging of underdrains or native soil
- Ponding depth should be a maximum of 12 inches, preferably 9 inches

ADVANTAGES / BENEFITS

- Applicable to small drainage areas
- Effective pollutant removals
- · Appropriate for small areas with high impervious cover, particularly parking lots
- Natural integration into landscaping for urban landscape enhancement
- Good retrofit capability
- Can be planned as an aesthetic feature and meet local planting requirements

DISADVANTAGES / LIMITATIONS

- Requires landscaping
- Not recommended for areas with steep slopes
- Medium to high capital cost
- Medium cost maintenance burden
- Soils may clog over time (may require cleaning or replacing)

MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS

- Inspect and repair or replace treatment area components such as mulch, plants, and scour protection, as needed
- Ensure bioretention area is draining properly so it does not become a breeding ground for mosquitos
- Remove trash and debris
- Ensure mulch is 3-4 inches thick in the practice
- Requires plant maintenance plan

POLLUTANT REMOVAL

Total Suspended Solids



Metals - Cadmium, Copper, ead, and Zinc removal

90× Pathogens – Fecal Coliform

assist designers determine what BMP to use

Updated Key Considerations to

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SUITABILITY

Runoff Reduction Water Quality

- Channel Protection
- Overbank Flood Protection
- Extreme Flood Protection
- ✓ suitable for this practice
- ★ may provide partial benefits

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Land Requirement

- Capital Cost
- Maintenance Burden

Residential Subdivision Use: Yes High Density/Ultra-Urban: Yes Roadway Projects: Yes

Soils: Engineered soil media is composed of sand, fines, and organic matter

Other Considerations: Use of native plants is recommended

L=Low M=Moderate H=High

RUNOFF REDUCTION CREDIT

- · 100% of the runoff reduction volume provided (no underdrain)
- 75% of the runoff reduction volume provided (upturned underdrain system)
- 50% of the runoff reduction volume provided (underdrain)

Updated Runoff Reduction Credit





4.2.5.2 GENERAL DESIGN

- A bioretention area consists of the following:
 - 1. A pretreatment area, usually consisting of a grass filter strip between the contributing drainage area and the ponding area or a forebay to ease maintenance of the mulch, sand, or soil layers.
 - 2. Ponding area c
 - engineered pla 3. Organic/mulch media.

Updated physical specifications

- Native soils to i
- (see description of infiltration trenches, Section 4.12, for infiltration criteria).
- Where native soils have low infiltration rates include gravel and perforated pipe underdrain system to collect runoff that has filtered through the soil layers and pipe it to the storm sewer system. An upturned underdrain system can be used, however, the system should be 12-18" below the bottom of the planted area to reduce saturated conditions in root zone.
- 6. Overflow, diversion or bypass structure to safely route larger storms through or around the bioretention area.
- A bioretention area design may include some of the following:
 - » Optional level spreader to spread and filter runoff.
 - » For curbed pavements use an inlet deflector to direct flow into the practice.
 - » A splash/erosion prevention pad at the inlet to the practice.

See Figure 4.2-5 and Figure 4.2-6 for an overview of the various components of a bioretention area.

4.2.5.3 PHYSICAL SPECIFICATIONS/GEOMETRY

- Recommended minimum dimensions of a bioretention area are 3-6% of the total drainage area, though modeling is recommended to accurately size the area.
- The maximum recommended ponding depth of the bioretention areas is 12 inches.
- A grass filter strip or channel can be used for pretreatment. The length of the grass channel or width of the grass filter strip depends on the drainage area, land use, and channel slope. Design guidance on grass change for pretreatment can be found in Se

Updated

the location of the

(Grass Channel in Section 4.29 gravel diaphrag specifications for used

The mulch laye
 BMP

of triple-shredded narowood mulen. This provides additional benefits such as removing sediment and metals and retaining soil moisture

- · If the native soils cannot suffice for the planting media used within the bioretention area planting beds, then an engineered soil mix should be provided that meets the following specifications:
 - » Texture: Sandy loam or loamy sand
 - » Sand Content: Soils should contain 35%-60% clean, washed sand

Other Constraints / Considerations

- Hot spots Do not use for hot spot runoff.
- Damage to existing structures and facilities Consideration should be given to the impact of water exfiltrating the bioretention areas on nearby road bases.
- · Proximity The following is a list of specific setback requirements for the location of a bioretention area:
- » 10 feet from building foundations
- » 100 feet from private water supply wells
- » 200 feet from public water supply reservoirs (measured from edge of water)
- » 1,200 feet from public water supply wells
- Trout Stream Evaluate for stream warming when an underdrain system is used.

In addition, careful consideration should be given to the potential of perched or raised groundwater levels. Provide adequate distance from building foundations or use impermeable liner on side of excavated area nearest to structure.

Challenges and Potential Solutions for Coastal Areas

 Poorly Drained Soils—This condition minimizes the ability of bioretention areas to reduce stormwater runoff rates and volumes. One solution would be to include an underdrain system. An alternative would be to use a small stormwater wetlands or wet swales to intercept and treat stormwater runoff.





4.2.6 Design Procedures

- (Step 1) Determine if the development site and conditions are appropriate for the use of a bioretention area. Consider the application and site feasibility criteria in this chapter. In addition, determine if site conditions are suitable for an bioretention area. Create a rough layout of the bioretention area dimensions taking into consideration existing trees, utility lines, and other obstructions.
- (Step 2) Determine the goals and primary function of the bioretention area.

Consider whether the bioretention area is intended to:

- » Meet a runoff reduction* target or water quality (treatment) target. For information on the sizing of a BMP utilizing the runoff reduction approach, see Step 3A. For information on the sizing of the BMP utilizing the water quality treatment approach, see Step 4A. *Note that minimum infiltration rates of the surrounding native soils must be acceptable and suitable when used in runoff reduction applications.
- » Be "oversized" to include partial credit for storage capacity for other stormwater requirements (Channel Protection Volume (Cp.)
- » Provide a possible solution to a drainage problem
- » Enhance landscape and provide aesthetic qualities

Check with local officials and other agencies to determine if there are any additional restrictions and/or surface water or watershed requirements that may apply. In addition, consider if the best management practice has any special site-specific design conditions or criteria. List any restrictions or other requirements that may apply or affect the design.

The design of the BMP should be centered on the restrictions/requirements, goals, targets, and primary function(s) of the BMP, described in this section. By considering the primary function, as well as, topographic and soil conditions, the design elements of the practice can be determined (i.e. planting media, underdrain, inlet/outlet, overflow, etc.)

Complete Step 3A, 3B, and 3C for a runoff reduction approach, or skip Step 3 and complete Steps 4A and 4B for a water quality (treatment) approach. Refer to your local community's guidelines for any additional information or specific requirements regarding the use of either method.

(Step 3A) Calculate the Stormwater Runoff Reduction Target Volume

Calculate the Runoff Reduction Volume using the following formula:

 $RR_v = (P) (R_v) (A) / 12$

Where:

Updated

design steps

based on new

research and

incorporated

calculations

runoff

reduction

 $RR_v = Runoff Reduction Target Volume (ft³)$ <math>P = Target runoff reduction rainfall (inches) $R_v = Volumetric runoff coefficient which can be$ found by:

 $R_v = 0.05 + 0.009(I)$

Where:

I = new impervious area of the contributing drainage area (%)

A = Area draining to this practice (ft²)
 12 = Unit conversion factor (in/ft)

Updated Graphics

Graphics were updated based on new research for BMPs





Digital Design Details



Digital Design Details





Updates to Appendices

Added Reference to:

- NOAA online rainfall data (http://hdsc.nws.noaa.gov/hdsc/pfds/pfds_map_cont.html?bkmrk=ga)
- Soils Information for Georgia

• Removed:

- Computer Models
- Georgia Safe Dams Act
- Miscellaneous Specifications





Updates to Volume 2, Appendix D: Planting & Soil Guidance

- Consolidated plant list
- Additional information and characteristics on trees, shrubs, and plant selection
- Updates to soil tests, utilizing on-site soils, and utilizing a manufactured soil media.





Updates to Volume 2, Appendix D: Planting & Soil Guidance

- Includes planting media characteristics
- Requirements for landscape plans
- Examples of typical profiles for BMPs



- Additional information for establishing vegetation and maintenance
- Infiltration testing information





VOL2 646

enting

8 Sali G

Areas that have recently been involved in construction as well as some native soils can become compacted so that plant roots cannot penetrate the soil. Seeds lying on the surface of compacted soils can be washed away or be eaten by birds. Soils should be loosened to a minimum depth of four inches, preferably to a six-inch depth. Hard soils may require a deeper depth. Loosening soils will improve seed contact with the soil, provide greater germination rates, and allow the roots to penetrate into the soil. Sod and other plantings will also benefit from loosened soil.

D.2.2 Compaction, Construction and

Minerals -- such as chelated iron, lime

Salinity

Toxicity

- Nutrient levels -- nitrogen, phosphorus,
- Soil Permeability pH -- whether acid, neutral, or alkali
- Soil texture

and to provide plant establishment and plant growth can be limited by a number of different soil characteristics such as:





Soil Permeability- Soil permeability is an important design factor in stormwater BMPs. It is advantageous and sometimes necessary to have high permeability in-situ soils for systems where infiltration may be desired (e.g. bioretention, infiltration practices, etc.). It is also advantageous and sometimes necessary to have low permeability in-situ soil for systems where permanent ponded water is required (e.g. stormwater wetlands, wet detention basins, etc.). In some BMP systems (e.g. sand filters, bioretention, etc.), high permeability media is required within the BMP, but since relatively small quantities are typically required, suitable soils can be imported to a site if necessary.

Soil texture: is determined by the percentage of sand, silt, and clay in the soil. The structure of a soil is influenced by soil texture and also by the combination of small soil particles into larger particles. The amount of aggregation in a soil is strongly influenced by the amount of organic matter present. Soils are made up of four basic ingredients: mineral elements, pore space, organic matter and other items consisting mainly of living organisms including fungi, bacteria, and nematodes. One classification of soils is based upon the mineral part of soil and consists of four sizes of particles. Clay particles are the smallest, followed by silt, sand, and gravel. The USDA has devised another system of classifying soil particles. In this system soil is divided into seven categories: clay, silt, and five sizes of sand.

	Swame Cottonwee Habit
	Was Cottonue Tree
	safer Ash The Design
	Swamp West
	Laurel Outritte Oak Tree Deciduous Native House
	Overe Oak Tree Decidus Native 4.5 Use Harding
	Vercup Oak The Decision Nation 3,45 USDA Zone
	swamp Chast Tee Destaduous Native E USDA Zee
	Water Oak Iree Deciduous Native Z USDA - USD
	Chernet Tree Deciding Native 3,4,5 Lice Zone A. o
1	Vin O Decide Vin A.5 USUA Zone Z
l,	Joak Te Davis Nation 345 USDA Zone 3-8
ľ	Illow On The Deciduous No. USDA - USDA - 9
ł,	umask Iree Deciduous Native 4,5 USDA 20ne 5-0
6	Oak Tree Deciduos Native 4,5 Use Zone Co
I	Asial Plain With The Decide Native 4.5 USDA Zone 6-8
ł	Willow nee Deviduous Net: d E USDA Zee 9
	Jow Tree Deciduous Native 7.5 USDA 20ne 4-8
	Press Tree Decidies Native 3,4,5 USE Long 4 - 9
	Decide Native 4.5 USUA Zone C
	press liree Nation 345 USDA Zone 5-9
	Deciding Deciding Jac USDA 2
	Elm Tree Tree Jobus Native J.4,5 USDA Cone 7-8
	Decide 234 Zone 2 G
	In Tree Nation USDA 7
	Buckey Tree Deciduos 274 200 4-0
l	neve She Decide Native
۱	Shrub Desiduous Nation 345 SUA Zone 4 o
۱	Shrub Deciduous Ala USDA 3
	Shrub Deciduous Native USDA Lone 2-0
	Shrub Deciduar Native 3.4.5 Union Zone z o
	oush Shall Decid OUS Nation 3,45 USDA Zona
	ish Chinub Deviduous National 345 USDA Zone 4-8
	Shrub Deciduous Native 2.4.5 USDA = 4-8
	Shrub Deciduous Native 3,4,5 USA Zone 5-8
	Shruk Decides Native 2.3.4 USUA Zone 4
	Daria Daria 45 USDA Zona 4-9
	Shrub diguous National dis USDA 7an e 5-9
	c Decidure TALIVE TAL USDA - 7
	anrub F. Satis 3,4,5 USD: Zone 5, 8
	hrub Evergreen AF SUA Zone Zo
	Decidues Native USDA -
	Voc up Decision Nation 3,45 Cone 5-0
	531 VD Fine 234 USDA Zan
	Evergreen Native Zuga USDA 20ne 4-9
	Deciduous Native 3,4,5 LISD. Lone 3-0
-	Native 5 USE ZODE C
	3.4.5 USDA Zona 5-9
	USDA Zone 3-9
	120ne 4-9

Georgia Native Plant List (continued lame

Idix D: Plan

FILIA

œ 3 Soll Guidan

New Operations and Maintenance Guidance Document

- Reference for inspectors and maintenance workers detailing the following:
 - Key Components of a BMP
 - Importance of Inspecting a BMP
 - Maintenance Agreements
 - General Maintenance
 - Vegetation Maintenance
- Written in a more simplified language for use by a broader audience





New Operations and Maintenance Guidance Document

Bioretention Areas

system or a nearby water body

Sediment build-up

Ant mounds

but are not limited to, the following





BMP Maintenance and Inspection Checklists

- Each BMP description in Vol. 2, Sect.
 4 includes:
 - A description of how the BMP functions
 - A typical photo
 - Common maintenance issues
 - Key maintenance items
 - Typical routine maintenance activities and schedule
 - Inspection checklists









BMP Check	list	-			Bi	oret	ent	ion Area			
				0.4 -	intenance Item			Conditi	on		Commont
				IVIa	Intenance item	Goo	bd	Marginal	Poor	N/A	comment
						Gener	al In	spection			
	Access for insr	to the site	e is adequately maintained								
			Area is	clean (tra	sh debris grass clinnings		-+				
			etc. rer	noved).	511) acons, 81ass enppings,						
						Inlet	t Str	ructure			
		3	Draina	ge ways (o	overland flow or pipes) to						
Pi											
BI	oreten	cion Area									
		Conditi	on				_				
Maintenance Item	Good	Marginal	Poor	N/A [*]	Comment						
0	ieneral li	nspection		• •							
Access to the site is adequately maintained											
for inspection and maintenance.											
Area is clean (trash, debris, grass clippings,											
etc. removed).											
	Inlet St	ructure					ent	(choose on	2)		
Drainage ways (overland flow or pipes) to											
the practice are free of trash, debris, large							-+				
branches, etc.											
Area around the inlet structure is mowed							\rightarrow				
and grass clippings are removed.											
No evidence of gullies, rills, or excessive											
erosion around the inlet structure.							_				
Water is going through structure (i.e. no											
evidence of water going around the											
structure).							n Tre	atment		T	
Diversion structure (high flow bypass											
structure or other) is free of trash, debris, or							+				
sediment. Comment on overall condition of											
diversion structure and list type.											01. 2. XII T1078 X502
											1776

BMP Checkli

Overview

BMP Checklist	Bioretention Area									
		Maintenance Item Cor								Comment
O_{VOD}			Good Margin						N/A [*]	connent
Overview		Access	to the site	is adequa	tely maintained	Selleral	Inspection			
Pretreatment	(choo	for ins	pection an	d mainten	ance.	I	<u> </u>]-			
Forebay – area is free of trash, debris, and sediment.	(0.100		/							
Weir – area is free of trash, debris, and sediment is less than 25% of the total depth of the weir.										
Filter Strip or Grass Channels – area is free of trash debris and sediment. Area has been mowed and grass clippings are removed. No evidence of erosion.										
Rock Lined Plunge Pools – area is free of trash debris and sediment. Rock thickness in pool is adequate.										
Main Tre	atme	nt								
Main treatment area is free of trash, debris, and sediment.							-	ne)		
Erosion protection is present on site (i.e. turf reinforcement mats). Comment on types of erosion protection and evaluate condition.										
		trash o mowe eviden Rock L trash o	ebris and d and grass ce of erosi ined Plung lebris and adequate	sediment. s clippings on. e Pools – a sediment.	Area has been are removed. No rea is free of Rock thickness in					
			aacquate	·		Main Tr	reatment			
		Main t and se	reatment a diment.	area is free	of trash, debris,					
		Erosio reinfor	n protectio cement m	n is preser ats). Comr	nt on site (i.e. turf nent on types of					



		Bioretention Area												
	JKI	ISL												
					Maintenance Item	C 1	Condit	N/0*	Comment					
Overview				N	lo evidence of long-term pondi	ng or	Good	Marginal	Poor	N/A				
				st	tanding water in the ponding a	rea of the								
				pi pi	ractice (examples include: stall posquito larvae, etc)	ns, odors,								
				St	tructure seems to be working p	properly. No								
				se	ettling around the structure. Co	omment on								
				0	verall condition of structure.									
		egetation within and around p	ractice is											
					naintained per landscaping plai	n. Grass								
					nppings are removed. Autobing denth of 3-4 inches is	maintained								
				G	omment on mulch depth.	mannameu.								
				N	ative plants were used in the p	oractice								
[
Bi	oreten	tion Area				n plants								
	orecen	tion Area				of the soil,								
	Condition					ellow,								
Maintenance Item	Good	Marginal	Poor	N/A*	Comment	good								
No ovidence of long term pending or		-		-		n of plants.								
standing water in the ponding area of the						Er	Emergency Overflow							
practice (examples include: stains, odors,						sh, debris,								
mosquito larvae, etc).														
Structure seems to be working properly. No						flooding								
settling around the structure. Comment on							Outlast							
overall condition of structure.						lebric and	Outlet 5	tructure		г т				
Vegetation within and around practice is						acons, anu								
maintained per landscaping plan. Grass						flooding								
clippings are removed.						0								
Mulching depth of 3-4 inches is maintained.							Res	ults						
Comment on mulch depth.						Area:								
Native plants were used in the practice						Ac	ditional	Comments						
according to the planting plan.														
No evidence of use of fertilizer on plants														
(Tertilizer crusting on the surface of the soil,														
tips of leaves turning brown or yellow,														
Plants seem to be healthy and in good						item was not	tcheckor	nlease cho	ck N/A a	nd evolo	in why in the appropria			
condition. Comment on condition of plants						item was not	checket	, please the	CK IN/ A d	па ехріа	in why in the appropria			
contracting comment of contraction of plants.														
											17			

BMP Checklist **Bioretention Area** Condition Maintenance Item Comment N/A Marginal Poor Good **Overview** No evidence of long-term ponding or standing water in the ponding area of the practice (examples include: stains, odors, **Emergency Overflow** . No Emergency overflow is free of trash, debris, on and sediment. No evidence of erosion, scour, or flooding around the structure. **Outlet Structure** ned. Outlet structure is free of trash, debris, and sediment. No evidence of erosion, scour, or flooding around the structure. soil. Results Overall condition of Bioretention Area: **Additional Comments** ants. **Emergency Overflow** bris, ng Notes: If a specific maintenance item was not checked, please check N/A and explain why in the appropriate **Outlet Structure** and comment box. seament. No evidence of erosion, scour, or flooding around the structure. Results Overall condition of Bioretention Area: Additional Comments Notes: ^{*}If a specific maintenance item was not checked, please check N/A and explain why in the appropriate comment box. 20日 回到

- Assists designers and developers to incorporate runoff reduction and water quality requirements into design plans
- Assists local jurisdictions with the review of design plans
- Provides a visual to show if the runoff reduction or water quality standard was met
- A User's Manual was developed that explains how the Tool functions







	Stor	Geor mwat	gia Si er Qu	tormwa ality S V	ate ite ers	r M De ion	anag velo 2.0	geme pmer	nt l nt R	Manu Reviev	al v To	ol					\sim				
				Gen	era	Info	rmati	on													
Name of Developer:)ate S	Submitt	ed:													
Development Name:					Ī	Permi	t Numb	er:													
Site Location / Address:					[)evelo	oper Co	ontact:													
					- I	phone	e Numb	er:													
					1	lame	of Eng	ineer(s):													
Development Type:						Aainte	enance	Respon	sibilit	y:											
				9	Site	Sum	marv														
Total Pre-Development Ar	ea (ac):	11.00																			
Total Post-Development Ar	ea (ac):	11.00						T	Total S	uspended	Solids (TSS) Rei	noval								
Total Treated Ar	ea (ac):	11.00				100%															
Total Untreated Ar	ea (ac):	0.00				90%															
					- 5	70%			_												
		l (ac)	P (ac)	CA (ac)	_ Ť	60%			_												
Drainage Basin 1	DB 1	1.90	0.60	0.50	Pa	50%	-		_												
Drainage Basin 2	DB 2	1.90	1.10	0.00	_ <u>2</u>	40%			_								┟ <u>┙┙</u> ┻				
Drainage Basin 3	DB 3	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.	30%			_								l s	hows	wate	r qual	itv
Drainage Basin 4	DB 4	0.00	0.00	0.00	_	20%	- %	~ ~	- 8	28	28	28	28	28	28		Ĭ		££		,
Drainage Basin 6	DB6	0.00	0.00	0.00	_	10%	- ¥-		ΞĦ	8	8	8	8	8	8	8		x runo	n rec	auciio	Ω
Drainage Basin 7	DB 7	0.00	0.00		_	070	DB 1	DB 2	DB 3	DB4	DB 5	DB 6	DB7	DB 8	DB 9	DB 10	a	chiever	ment	ls on t	the
Drainage Basin 8	DB 8	0.00	0.00	0.00														haein	and	brojed	. t
Drainage Basin 9	DB 9	0.00	0.00	0.00						Ru	off Red	uction (I	RR)					Jasin		biojec	ρι –
Drainage Basin 10	DB 10	0.00	0.00	0.00		100%											1		level		
	TOTAL	3.80	6.70	0.50		90%															
	l-Impervis	aur Aroa, P - Porv	iow Area, CA - C	onrorvation Aroa	5	70%															
					Σ																
Target Runoff Reduction V	olume A	chieved?	NO		2	50%			_												
Target ISS Re	moval A	chieved?	Yes		- H	40%			_								-				
Total Target Runoff Ped	uction W	nlume (cf)	13 286		- 8	30%	+														
Runoff Reduction Vol	ume Act	nieved (cf)	8 804		_	20%	~	. 0	~	v 9	\$ 9	\$	~	v 9	\$. 9					
Total Target Water G	Quality V	olume (cf)	15,943			10%	- <u>R</u>	8	6	8	8	-8	8	-8	8	8	1 H				
% TSS F	Removal	Achieved	95%			070	DB 1	DB 2	DB 3	DB 4	DB 5	DB 6	DB 7	DB 8	DB 9	DB 10	1				
				0	field		0. Omb														
Ter -1' #				0	TICL	ll US	e Uni	y												CHARGE T	C
I racking #:							Cond	iuons of	Appr	ovar:										AN IN	0
Date Approved:																					<u> </u>
Date Approved.																				IS &	118->
	NCEDV		SEMEN			EOP	MOE		стю				тніст		ст						





			S	elect BN	IPs for Rur	noff Reduc	tion and	Water Qu	ality							
		Area Di	raining to Eac	h BMP	Storage	RR		Runoff Reduction Calculations							VQ Calculations	
		On-site Pervious Area (acres)	On-site Impervious Area (acres)	Offsite Area (acres)	Yolume Provided by BMP (cf)	Conveyance Yolume Provided by BMP (cf)	Down- stream BMP	RR ¥olume from Direct Drainage (cf)	RR Volume from Upstream Practices (cf)	Total RR Volume Received by BMP (cf)	Runoff Reduction %	RR Achieved (cf)	Remaining RR ¥olume (cf)	¥Q, from Direct Drainage (cf)	Effective TSS Removal %	
BMP 1	Downspout Disconnect (C & D hydrologic soils)	0.00	0.30	0.00		1,035	BMP 2	1,035	0	1,035	25%	259	776	1,241	80%	
BMP 2	Bioretention Basin (₩ underdrain)	1.10	1.37		5,000			4,924	1,490	6,414	50%	2,500	3,914	5,909	85%	
BMP 3	Grass Channel (C & D hydrologic soils)		0.23			793	B. 1P 2	793	0	793	10%	79	714	952	50%	
BMP 4	Select a BMP_							0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 5	Select a BMP_							0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 6	Select a BMP_								0	0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 7	Select a BMP_							0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 8	Select a BMP_							0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 9	Select a BMP_							0		0	N/A	0	0	0	N/A	
BMP 10	Select a BMP_							0	0	0	N/A	0	0	0	NłA	
	TOTAL	1.10	1.90	0.00				6,752				2,838		8,102		
	UNTREATED AREA (acres) Target Runoff Reduction Volume (cf) Target Achieved?	6,752 No		1					Ì	Allow	us treatr	ment				
	Hemaining Hunoff Heduction Volume [cf] Target Vater Quality Volume (cf) % TSS Removal Achieved Target Achieved? Remaining TSS Removal %	3,914 8,102 88% Yes! 0%								trains	or indiv BMPs	vidual				
				Autor	natically reductio	calculate	es SS									

removal achieved

		Chai	nnel and Fl	ood Protec	tion Calculations
	1-yr, 24-hr storm	2-yr, 24-hr storm	25-yr, 24-hr storm	100-yr, 24-hr storm	
Target Rainfall Event (in)	3.40	4.20	7.90	9.80	
					-
	1-yr, 24-hr	2-yr, 24-hr	25-yr, 24-hr	100-yr, 24-hr	
	storm	storm	storm	storm	
Pre-Development Runoff Volume (in)	0.95	1.46	4.38	6.05	
Post Development Runoff Volume (in) with no BMPs	2.19	2.92	6.48	8.35	
Post-Development Runoff Volume (in) with BMPs	1.93	2.66	6.22	8.09	
Adjusted CN	85	85	86	86	
*See Stormwater Management Standards to Determine Detention Requirements.					-

Calculates adjusted CN based on the runoff reduction achieved

