



Design Considerations

- Accumulation of Metals
- Clogged Soil Outlet Structures
- Vegetation/Landscape Maintenance

Description

An infiltration trench is a long, narrow, rock-filled trench with no outlet that receives stormwater runoff. Runoff is stored in the void space between the stones and infiltrates through the bottom and into the soil matrix. Infiltration trenches perform well for removal of fine sediment and associated pollutants.

Pretreatment using buffer strips, swales, or detention basins is important for limiting amounts of coarse sediment entering the trench which can clog and render the trench ineffective.

California Experience

Caltrans constructed two infiltration trenches at highway maintenance stations in Southern California. Of these, one failed to operate to the design standard because of average soil infiltration rates lower than that measured in the single infiltration test. This highlights the critical need for appropriate evaluation of the site. Once in operation, little maintenance was required at either site.

Advantages

- Provides 100% reduction in the load discharged to surface waters.
- An important benefit of infiltration trenches is the approximation of pre-development hydrology during which a significant portion of the average annual rainfall runoff is infiltrated rather than flushed directly to creeks.
- If the water quality volume is adequately sized, infiltration trenches can be useful for providing control of channel forming (erosion) and high frequency (generally less than the 2-year) flood events.

Targeted Constituents

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sediment	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nutrients	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Trash	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Metals	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bacteria	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oil and Grease	■
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Organics	■

Legend (Removal Effectiveness)

- Low
- High
- ▲ Medium



- As an underground BMP, trenches are unobtrusive and have little impact of site aesthetics.

Limitations

- Have a high failure rate if soil and subsurface conditions are not suitable.
- May not be appropriate for industrial sites or locations where spills may occur.
- The maximum contributing area to an individual infiltration practice should generally be less than 5 acres.
- Infiltration basins require a minimum soil infiltration rate of 0.5 inches/hour, not appropriate at sites with Hydrologic Soil Types C and D.
- If infiltration rates exceed 2.4 inches/hour, then the runoff should be fully treated prior to infiltration to protect groundwater quality.
- Not suitable on fill sites or steep slopes.
- Risk of groundwater contamination in very coarse soils.
- Upstream drainage area must be completely stabilized before construction.
- Difficult to restore functioning of infiltration trenches once clogged.

Design and Sizing Guidelines

- Provide pretreatment for infiltration trenches in order to reduce the sediment load. Pretreatment refers to design features that provide settling of large particles before runoff reaches a management practice, easing the long-term maintenance burden. Pretreatment is important for all structural stormwater management practices, but it is particularly important for infiltration practices. To ensure that pretreatment mechanisms are effective, designers should incorporate practices such as grassed swales, vegetated filter strips, detention, or a plunge pool in series.
- Specify locally available trench rock that is 1.5 to 2.5 inches in diameter.
- Determine the trench volume by assuming the WQV will fill the void space based on the computed porosity of the rock matrix (normally about 35%).
- Determine the bottom surface area needed to drain the trench within 72 hr by dividing the WQV by the infiltration rate.

$$d = \frac{WQV + RFV}{SA}$$

- Calculate trench depth using the following equation:

where:

D = Trench depth

WQV	=	Water quality volume
RFV	=	Rock fill volume
SA	=	Surface area of the trench bottom

- The use of vertical piping, either for distribution or infiltration enhancement shall not be allowed to avoid device classification as a Class V injection well per 40 CFR146.5(e)(4).
- Provide observation well to allow observation of drain time.
- May include a horizontal layer of filter fabric just below the surface of the trench to retain sediment and reduce the potential for clogging.

Construction/Inspection Considerations

Stabilize the entire area draining to the facility before construction begins. If impossible, place a diversion berm around the perimeter of the infiltration site to prevent sediment entrance during construction. Stabilize the entire contributing drainage area before allowing any runoff to enter once construction is complete.

Performance

Infiltration trenches eliminate the discharge of the water quality volume to surface receiving waters and consequently can be considered to have 100% removal of all pollutants within this volume. Transport of some of these constituents to groundwater is likely, although the attenuation in the soil and subsurface layers will be substantial for many constituents.

Infiltration trenches can be expected to remove up to 90 percent of sediments, metals, coliform bacteria and organic matter, and up to 60 percent of phosphorus and nitrogen in the infiltrated runoff (Schueler, 1992). Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) removal is estimated to be between 70 to 80 percent. Lower removal rates for nitrate, chlorides and soluble metals should be expected, especially in sandy soils (Schueler, 1992). Pollutant removal efficiencies may be improved by using washed aggregate and adding organic matter and loam to the subsoil. The stone aggregate should be washed to remove dirt and fines before placement in the trench. The addition of organic material and loam to the trench subsoil may enhance metals removal through adsorption.

Siting Criteria

The use of infiltration trenches may be limited by a number of factors, including type of native soils, climate, and location of groundwater table. Site characteristics, such as excessive slope of the drainage area, fine-grained soil types, and proximate location of the water table and bedrock, may preclude the use of infiltration trenches. Generally, infiltration trenches are not suitable for areas with relatively impermeable soils containing clay and silt or in areas with fill.

As with any infiltration BMP, the potential for groundwater contamination must be carefully considered, especially if the groundwater is used for human consumption or agricultural purposes. The infiltration trench is not suitable for sites that use or store chemicals or hazardous materials unless hazardous and toxic materials are prevented from entering the trench. In these areas, other BMPs that do not allow interaction with the groundwater should be considered.

The potential for spills can be minimized by aggressive pollution prevention measures. Many municipalities and industries have developed comprehensive spill prevention control and countermeasure (SPCC) plans. These plans should be modified to include the infiltration trench and the contributing drainage area. For example, diversion structures can be used to prevent spills from entering the infiltration trench. Because of the potential to contaminate groundwater, extensive site investigation must be undertaken early in the site planning process to establish site suitability for the installation of an infiltration trench.

Longevity can be increased by careful geotechnical evaluation prior to construction and by designing and implementing an inspection and maintenance plan. Soil infiltration rates and the water table depth should be evaluated to ensure that conditions are satisfactory for proper operation of an infiltration trench. Pretreatment structures, such as a vegetated buffer strip or water quality inlet, can increase longevity by removing sediments, hydrocarbons, and other materials that may clog the trench. Regular maintenance, including the replacement of clogged aggregate, will also increase the effectiveness and life of the trench.

Evaluation of the viability of a particular site is the same as for infiltration basins and includes:

- Determine soil type (consider RCS soil type 'A, B or C' only) from mapping and consult USDA soil survey tables to review other parameters such as the amount of silt and clay, presence of a restrictive layer or seasonal high water table, and estimated permeability. The soil should not have more than 30 percent clay or more than 40 percent of clay and silt combined. Eliminate sites that are clearly unsuitable for infiltration.
- Groundwater separation should be at least 3 m from the basin invert to the measured ground water elevation. There is concern at the state and regional levels of the impact on groundwater quality from infiltrated runoff, especially when the separation between groundwater and the surface is small.
- Location away from buildings, slopes and highway pavement (greater than 6 m) and wells and bridge structures (greater than 30 m). Sites constructed of fill, having a base flow or with a slope greater than 15 percent should not be considered.
- Ensure that adequate head is available to operate flow splitter structures (to allow the basin to be offline) without ponding in the splitter structure or creating backwater upstream of the splitter.
- Base flow should not be present in the tributary watershed.

Secondary Screening Based on Site Geotechnical Investigation

- At least three in-hole conductivity tests shall be performed using USBR 7300-89 or Bouwer-Rice procedures (the latter if groundwater is encountered within the boring), two tests at different locations within the proposed basin and the third down gradient by no more than approximately 10 m. The tests shall measure permeability in the side slopes and the bed within a depth of 3 m of the invert.
- The minimum acceptable hydraulic conductivity as measured in any of the three required test holes is 13 mm/hr. If any test hole shows less than the minimum value, the site should be disqualified from further consideration.

- Exclude from consideration sites constructed in fill or partially in fill unless no silts or clays are present in the soil boring. Fill tends to be compacted, with clays in a dispersed rather than flocculated state, greatly reducing permeability.
- The geotechnical investigation should be such that a good understanding is gained as to how the stormwater runoff will move in the soil (horizontally or vertically) and if there are any geological conditions that could inhibit the movement of water.

Maintenance

Infiltration trenches required the least maintenance of any of the BMPs evaluated in the Caltrans study, with approximately 17 field hours spent on the operation and maintenance of each site. Inspection of the infiltration trench was the largest field activity, requiring approximately 8 hr/yr.

In addition to reduced water quality performance, clogged infiltration trenches with surface standing water can become a nuisance due to mosquito breeding. If the trench takes more than 72 hours to drain, then the rock fill should be removed and all dimensions of the trench should be increased by 2 inches to provide a fresh surface for infiltration.

Cost

Construction Cost

Infiltration trenches are somewhat expensive, when compared to other stormwater practices, in terms of cost per area treated. Typical construction costs, including contingency and design costs, are about \$5 per ft³ of stormwater treated (SWRPC, 1991; Brown and Schueler, 1997). Actual construction costs may be much higher. The average construction cost of two infiltration trenches installed by Caltrans in southern California was about \$50/ft³; however, these were constructed as retrofit installations.

Infiltration trenches typically consume about 2 to 3 percent of the site draining to them, which is relatively small. In addition, infiltration trenches can fit into thin, linear areas. Thus, they can generally fit into relatively unusable portions of a site.

Maintenance Cost

One cost concern associated with infiltration practices is the maintenance burden and longevity. If improperly sited or maintained, infiltration trenches have a high failure rate. In general, maintenance costs for infiltration trenches are estimated at between 5 percent and 20 percent of the construction cost. More realistic values are probably closer to the 20-percent range, to ensure long-term functionality of the practice.

References and Sources of Additional Information

Caltrans, 2002, BMP Retrofit Pilot Program Proposed Final Report, Rpt. CTSW-RT-01-050, California Dept. of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.

Brown, W., and T. Schueler. 1997. *The Economics of Stormwater BMPs in the Mid-Atlantic Region*. Prepared for the Chesapeake Research Consortium, Edgewater, MD, by the Center for Watershed Protection, Ellicott City, MD.

Galli, J. 1992. *Analysis of Urban BMP Performance and Longevity in Prince George's County, Maryland*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC.

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). 2000. *Maryland Stormwater Design Manual*. <http://www.mde.state.md.us/environment/wma/stormwatermanual>. Accessed May 22, 2001.

Metzger, M. E., D. F. Messer, C. L. Beitia, C. M. Myers, and V. L. Kramer. 2002. The Dark Side Of Stormwater Runoff Management: Disease Vectors Associated With Structural BMPs. *Stormwater* 3(2): 24-39.

Schueler, T. 1987. *Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC.

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWRPC). 1991. *Costs of Urban Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Control Measures*. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, Waukesha, WI.

Watershed Management Institute (WMI). 1997. *Operation, Maintenance, and Management of Stormwater Management Systems*. Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

Information Resources

Center for Watershed Protection (CWP). 1997. *Stormwater BMP Design Supplement for Cold Climates*. Prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds, Washington, DC, by the Center for Watershed Protection, Ellicott City, MD.

Ferguson, B.K. 1994. *Stormwater Infiltration*. CRC Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. 1989. *Protecting Water Quality in Urban Areas: Best Management Practices*. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minneapolis, MN.

USEPA. 1993. *Guidance to Specify Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters*. EPA-840-B-92-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.

