



Design Considerations

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

Targeted Constituent Removal

Sediment	High
Nutrients	High
Trash	High
Metals	High
Bacteria	High
Oil and Grease	High
Organics	High
Flow Control	Med

Description

An infiltration trench is a rock and media-filled trench with no outlet that receives stormwater runoff. Runoff is stored in the void space between the media and infiltrates through the sides and bottom and into the soil matrix. Infiltration trenches perform well for elimination of surface runoff up to their design capacity. Pretreatment using buffer strips, swales, or detention basins is important for limiting sediment from 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.

Infiltration trenches have been shown to be effective at reducing many of the pollutants regulated by the State and Regional Water Boards. Additionally, the Water Boards have determined that infiltration trenches can qualify as a "Full Capture System (FCS)¹" for trash. Accordingly, in addition to providing general specifications, this fact sheet includes trash-specific information to assist with upgrading either an existing BMP or the design of a planned BMP to meet the FCS definition. See the "**Full Trash Capture Compliance**" section and "**Trash FCS**" subsections in this fact sheet for more information.



¹ Full Capture System (FCS): A treatment control, or series of treatment controls, including but not limited to, a multi-benefit project or a low impact development control that traps all particles that are 5 mm or greater, and has a design treatment capacity that is either: a) of not less than the peak flow rate, Q, resulting from a one-year, one-hour, storm in the subdrainage area, or b) appropriately sized to, and designed to carry at least the same flows as, the corresponding storm drain.

Advantages

- Provides stormwater treatment and can be designed to meet hydromodification management requirements and the full capture system definition for trash control.
- 100% reduction in the load discharged to surface waters.
- Can achieve pre-development hydrology by infiltrating a significant portion of the average annual rainfall runoff.

Limitations

- Have a high failure rate if soil and subsurface conditions are not suitable, or if there is a high sediment loading to the trench.
- May not be appropriate for industrial sites or locations where spills may occur.
- Infiltration basins require a minimum soil infiltration rate of 0.5 inches/hour, not appropriate at sites with Hydrologic Soil Types C or D.

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. Actual pollutant removal in the subsurface would be expected to vary depending upon site-specific soil types (Table 1).

Table 1. Typical pollutant removal for constituents and removal processes

Pollutant	Typical Removal	Median Effluent Concentration ¹	Removal Processes	Treatment Depth	References
Sediment	High (90%)	9.9 mg/l	Settling, filtration and sedimentation in top 2 to 8 inches of media.	1.5 feet	Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering 2012; Hatt et al. 2008; Hunt et al. 2012; Li and Davis 2008; Stander and Borst 2010; Maniquiz, 2010; Scholes, 2007
Metals	High	TCd: 0.07 µg/L, TCr: 0.35 µg/L, TCu: 5.33 µg/L, TFe: 1027 µg/L, TPb: 0.19 µg/L, TNi: 4.53 µg/L, TZn: 12.0 µg/L	Settling with sediment and sorption to organic matter and clay in media.	2 feet	Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering 2012; Hsieh and Davis 2005; Hunt et al. 2012; Maniquiz, 2010

Pollutant	Typical Removal	Median Effluent Concentration ¹	Removal Processes	Treatment Depth	References
Hydrocarbons	High (90-97%)	N/A	Volatilization, sorption, and degradation in mulch layer.	1 foot	Hong et al. 2006; Hunt et al. 2012; Barraud et al 1999; Dierkes and Geiger, 1999; Mikkelsen et al. 1997; Hong et al. 2006. Hsieh and Davis 2005; Pitt et al. 1999
Total phosphorus	High (-240% to 99%)	<i>0.240 mg/l</i>	Settling with sediment, sorption to organic matter and clay in media, and plant uptake. Poor removal efficiency can result from media containing high organic matter or with high background concentrations of phosphorus.	2 feet	Clark and Pitt 2009; Davis 2007; Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering 2012; Hsieh and Davis 2005; Hunt et al. 2006; Hunt and Lord 2006; Li et al. 2010; Maniquiz 2010
Total nitrogen	High (TKN: -5% to 64%, Nitrate: 1% to 80%)	<u>TN: 0.92 mg/l</u> , TKN: 1.34 mg/l, NO _{2,3} -N: 0.37 mg/l	Sorption and settling (TKN), denitrification in IWS (nitrate), and plant uptake. Poor removal efficiency can result from media containing high organic matter.	3 feet	Barrett et al. 2013; Clark and Pitt 2009; Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering 2012; Hunt et al. 2006; Hunt et al. 2012; Kim et al. 2003; Li et al. 2010; Passeport et al. 2009; Maniquiz, 2010; Winiarski et al. 2006
Bacteria	High	<u>Enterococcus: 235 MPN/ 100 mL, E.coli: 101 MPN/100 mL</u>	Sedimentation, filtration, sorption, desiccation, predation, and photolysis in mulch layer and media.	2 feet	Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering 2012; Hathaway et al. 2009; Hathaway et al. 2011; Hunt and Lord 2006; Hunt et al. 2008; Hunt et al. 2012; Jones and Hunt 2010
Trash	High	<u>N/A</u>	Filtration	1.5 feet of media	Barrett et al. 2013

¹ Concentrations are based on bioretention performance data. Underlined effluent concentrations were (statistically) significantly lower than influent concentrations, as determined by statistical hypothesis testing on the available sampled data. Effluent concentrations displayed in *italics* were (statistically) significantly higher than influent concentrations.

Groundwater contamination concerns exists for infiltration trenches (Lind and Karro, 1995; Datry et al., 2004; Pitt, 1999) but pollutant concentrations in the soil column have been shown to decrease rapidly with depth (within the first 6 to 18 inches) (Dechesne, M. et al., 2004; Dierkes and Geiger, 1999; Mikkelsen et al., 1997; Datry et al., 2004). However, pollutant

concentrations can be of concern as deep as 10 feet, preferential flow pathways are suspected as the means of transport in some geologic settings (Winiarski et al. 2006). These observations warrant a 10 foot minimum between infiltration trench bottom and seasonal high water table.

Trash FCS

The Trash Amendments adopted by the State Water Board in April 2015 provide a performance standard for treatment of stormwater for trash in the form of the definition of FCS, which an infiltration trench meets (see Section 5.6.1 for FCS details).

Suitability and Design

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, can also preclude the use of infiltration trenches. The constraints of each site dictate the appropriate siting and footprint. Fundamental infiltration trench design components are as follows:

- Infiltration rate assessed on-site by a licensed geotechnical engineer or soil scientist.
- Unsuitable if known soil contamination is present, or if upstream drainage area uses or store chemicals or hazardous materials that could drain to the trench.
- 10 feet of separation between bottom of the trench and seasonal high water table.
- Drainage area that has been fully stabilized, plus use of a pretreatment BMP (e.g. grassed swales) at the entry point to ensure longevity.
- 10-ft setback from foundations, 100-ft from septic fields and water supply wells, and 50-ft from steep slopes.

Infiltration trench design is highly dependent on the constraints of the considered site. Costs will vary in accordance with the design. Table 2 details a number of core construction components and corresponding design considerations.

Table 2. Cost of design components and associated considerations

Component	Cost	Design Consideration
Excavation		Requires infiltration rate > 0.5 in/hr. When excavating ensure that subgrade compaction is minimized. Design for 6 to 18 inches average ponding depth. Trench should contain entire upstream WQV. After final grading, till the infiltration surface deeply
Without underdrains	\$2.75–\$5.00/ft ²	
With underdrains	\$3.90–\$6.15/ft ²	
Soil Media		

Component	Cost	Design Consideration
Recommended mix	\$2.90–\$4.30/ft ²	1.5–4 feet (deeper for better pollutant removal, hydrologic benefits, and rooting depths) at minimum 5 in/hr infiltration. Total phosphorus < 15 ppm, pH 6–8, CEC > 5 meq/100 g soil. Organic Matter Content < 5% by weight. 65% sand, 20% sandy loam, and 15% compost (from vegetation-based feedstock) by volume.
With engineered media	\$3.60–\$5.40/ft ²	
Soil Media Barrier		When incorporating an underdrain, separate media from native soil with a geotextile layer, 2 to 4 inches of washed sand (ASTM C-33), followed by 2 inches of choking stone (ASTM No. 8) over a 1.5 ft envelope of ASTM No. 57 stone.
Geotextile	\$0.45/ft ²	
Washed sand (2-inch layer)	\$0.20/ft ²	
No. 8 aggregate (min 2 inches thick)	\$0.28/ft ²	
No. 57 stone (1.5 + feet)	\$2.49/ft ²	
Hydraulic Restriction Layer		May use hydraulic restriction layer on vertical surfaces to restrict lateral flows to adjacent subgrades, foundations, or utilities.
Filter fabric	\$0.45/ft ²	
Clay	\$0.65/ft ²	
30-mil liner	\$0.35/ft ²	
Concrete barrier	\$12.00/ft ²	
Landscape	\$0.20–\$3.50/ft ²	Armor surface with cobble or vegetation. If planted (optional), install native, deep rooting, and drought tolerant plants.

To provide adequate drainage the bottom surface area can be calculated to drain the trench within 72 hr by dividing the WQV by the infiltration rate. Where:

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

- d = Trench depth
- WQV = Water quality volume
- RFV = Rock fill volume
- SA = Surface area of the trench bottom

Full Trash Capture Compliance

This section provides trash-specific information to assist with upgrading either an existing BMP or the design of a planned BMP to meet the FCS definition. In addition to developing and adopting the Trash Amendments, the State Water Board provides implementation information on its Trash Implementation web page:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/trash_implementation.html

The web page includes information on best management practices or Full Capture Systems, including lists of State-certified Multi-Benefit Trash Treatment Systems. So, when selecting BMPs for trash control, fact sheet users should refer to both this BMP fact sheet and the State Water Board's Trash Implementation web page.

Design Modifications to Prevent Trash Migration, Sustain Capacity, and Prevent Reduced Functionality

The infiltration trench must be configured to allow trash to enter the system and for trash to remain in the BMP until it can be collected and removed. To meet the requirement, inlets must be designed to pass the peak flow produced by the one-year, one-hour design storm or the same flows as the capacity of the inlet storm drain and solids that would be retained by a 5 mm screen or mesh, must remain in the system.

Inlets

There are a multitude of inlet configurations that will allow trash to enter and be captured in an infiltration trench. An open curb cut is recommended for high traffic areas (Figure 1). A minimum 2 inch drop from the gutter line of the curb to the inlet is recommended as demonstrated in Figure 1 to ensure that flow is routed into the infiltration trench and trash will not clog the inlet.




Figure 1. Example Inlet Detail

Pretreatment

Pretreatment is beneficial to increase and consolidate trash capture while managing maintenance requirements. A forebay (Figure 2), filter strip (Figure 4), or mortared cobble inside the curb cut (Figure 3) can slow flow and allow trash and gross solids to settle out while



Figure 3. Example of a forebay as pretreatment

consolidating at the edge of the infiltration trench area to make it easier for maintenance crews to collect and remove.

Trash Containment

Once trash has been captured in an infiltration trench it must be contained so trash does not escape the infiltration trench. Containment may be provided by one or more of these features:

- an external design feature or up-gradient structure designed to bypass flows exceeding the region-specific one-year, one-hour storm event; or
- the BMP having sufficient capacity to trap particles from flows exceeding those generated by the one-year, one-hour storm event; or
- the BMP having sufficient capacity to treat either the design flows or volumes through media filtration or infiltration into native or amended soils; or
- use of a maximum 5 mm mesh screen on all outlets.



Figure 2. Example of mortared cobble for pretreatment with a curb cut.



Figure 4. Example of filter strip as pretreatment

Figure 5 shows an example of an outlet with a screen to contain trash.

Maintenance

Infiltration trenches required the least maintenance of any of the BMPs evaluated in a 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 (Caltrans, 2002).



Figure 5. Example of an outlet with 5 mm screen.

Clogged infiltration trenches reduced water quality performance but can also enable standing water to 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. To mitigate failure, ensure particulate loading of the stormwater is minimal, or is reduced with an adjacent pretreatment (Figure 1 through Figure 4). Reducing particulate loading enables the soil's infiltrative capacity to remain high and functional. Table 3 provides maintenance activity details, frequency, and costs.

Table 3. Typical maintenance activities and associated costs and frequency

Frequency	Cost	Activity
Routine Maintenance (required monthly to every 2 years)		
Routine (small)	\$7.62/ft ²	<u>Remove excess sediment, trash, and debris across the surface, inlet, and outlet.</u> Check for and stabilize erosion. Pruning and mowing overgrown vegetation that interferes with access, or safety (if applicable).
Routine (medium)	\$1.91/ft ²	
Routine (large)	\$1.91/ft ²	
End of Life Replacement (service life of 20 years)		
Replacement (small)	\$10.52/ft ²	Excavate to the depth of soil media. Test soil for excessive soil contamination of common stormwater pollutants (e.g. metals, nutrients). Continue to remove underlying soil if pollutants exceed standard for contaminated soil. Replace with clean soil.
Replacement (medium)	\$10.17/ft ²	
Replacement (large)	\$10.11/ft ²	
Note: Small System = 500 ft ² ; Medium System = 2000 ft ² ; Large System = 4000 ft ²		
<u>Underlined</u> statement indicates that the activity may be required more frequently than shown in the table to meet the State Water Board maintenance criteria for Multi-Benefit Treatment Systems to be qualified as Full Capture Systems.		


Trash FCS

Maintenance to Prevent Trash Migration, Sustain Capacity, and Prevent Reduced Functionality


For Multi-Benefit Treatment Systems to be qualified as Full Capture Systems, the State Water Board requires regular maintenance to maintain adequate trash capture capacity and to ensure that trapped trash does not migrate offsite. Additionally, the State Water Board requires the BMP owner to establish a maintenance schedule based on site-specific factors, including the design trash capacity of the Infiltration Trench Multi-Benefit Trash Treatment System, storm frequency, and estimated or measured trash loading from the drainage area. To meet those criteria, it is likely that the frequency of trash and debris removal will have to be increased above the recommended monthly interval during the wet season to prevent trash from being blown from the BMP or being washed out of the infiltration trench in the subsequent rain events (see Table 3). Depending on the frequency and size of storms, and upstream pollutant characteristics, trash and debris removal can be as frequent as before and after every wet weather event.

Trash maintenance not only plays a role in the functionality of the infiltration trench but also in the aesthetics and public perception of infiltration trenches (and of all BMPs). Part of maintaining positive perception among the public is the visibility of a well-maintained BMP. This positive perception can self-perpetuate further support for integrated stormwater management practices and therefore further investment in regular maintenance. The appropriate maintenance interval is best determined through observation of the trench over an average water year.

Schematic



A INFILTRATION TRENCH - PLAN VIEW
- NOT TO SCALE



A INFILTRATION TRENCH - SECTION
- NOT TO SCALE

References and Sources of Additional Information

- Barraud, S., A. Gautier, J. Bardin, V. Riou. 1999. The impact of intentional stormwater infiltration on soil and groundwater. *Water Science & Technology* 39: 185-192.
- Barrett, M.E., M. Limouzin, and D.F. Lawler. 2013. Effects of media and plant selection on Biofiltration performance. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 139(4):462-470.
- 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.
- Clark, S.E., and R. Pitt. 2009. Storm-water filter media pollutant retention under aerobic versus anaerobic conditions. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 135(5):367–371.
- Caltrans, 2002, BMP Retrofit Pilot Program Proposed Final Report, Rpt. CTSW-RT-01-050, California Dept. of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.
- Datry, T., F. Malard, J. Gibert. 2004. Dynamics of solutes and dissolved oxygen in shallow urban groundwater below a stormwater infiltration basin. *Science of the Total Environment* 329: 215–229.
- Davis, A.P. 2007. Field performance of bioretention: Water quality. *Environmental Engineering Science* 24(8):1048–1063.
- Dechesne, M., S. Barraud, J. Bardin. 2004. Spatial distribution of pollution in an urban stormwater infiltration basin *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology* 72: 189– 205.
- Dierkes, C., W. Geiger. 1999. Pollution retention capabilities of roadside soils *Water Science & Technology* 39: 201-208.
- Dorman, T., M. Frey, J. Wright, B. Wardynski, J. Smith, B. Tucker, J. Riverson, A. Teague, and K. Bishop. 2013. San Antonio River Basin Low Impact Development Technical Design Guidance Manual, v1. San Antonio River Authority. San Antonio, TX.
- Galli, J. 1992. *Analysis of Urban BMP Performance and Longevity in Prince George's County, Maryland*. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, DC.
- Geosyntec Consultants and Wright Water Engineering. 2012. *International Storm Water BMP Database Pollutant Category Summary Statistical Addendum: TSS, Bacteria, Nutrients, and Metals*. 2012. International Storm Water BMP Database. <http://www.bmpdatabase.org/>
- Hathaway, J.M., W.F. Hunt, and S.J. Jadlocki. 2009. Indicator bacteria removal in stormwater best management practices in Charlotte, North Carolina. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 135(12):1275–1285.

Hathaway, J.M., W.F. Hunt, A.K. Graves, and J.D. Wright. 2011. Field evaluation of bioretention indicator bacteria sequestration in Wilmington, NC. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 137(12):1103–1113.

Hong, E., M. Seagren, and A.P. Davis. 2006. Sustainable oil and grease removal from synthetic stormwater runoff using bench-scale bioretention studies. *Water Environment Research*. 78(2):141-155.

Hsieh, C.H., and A.P. Davis. 2005. Evaluation and optimization of bioretention media for treatment of urban stormwater runoff. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 131(11):1521–1531.

Hunt, W.F., and W.G. Lord. 2006. *Bioretention Performance, Design, Construction, and Maintenance*. North Carolina Cooperative Extension, Raleigh, NC.

Hunt, W.F., A.R. Jarrett, J.T. Smith, and L.J. Sharkey. 2006. Evaluating bioretention hydrology and nutrient removal at three field sites in North Carolina. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 132(6):600–608.

Hunt, W.F., A.P. Davis, and R.G. Traver. 2012. Meeting hydrologic and water quality goals through targeted bioretention design. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 138(6):698–707.

Jones, M.P., and W.F. Hunt. 2010. Effect of stormwater wetlands and wet ponds on runoff temperature in trout sensitive waters. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 136(9):656–661.

Kim, H., E.A. Seagren, and A.P. Davis. 2003. Engineered bioretention for removal of nitrate from stormwater runoff. *Water Environment Research* 75(4):355–367.

Li, M.-H., C.Y. Sung, M.H. Kim, and K.-H. Chu. 2010. *Bioretention for Stormwater Quality Improvements in Texas: Pilot Experiments*. Texas A&M University in cooperation with Texas Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration.

Li, H., and A.P. Davis. 2008. Urban particle capture in bioretention media. I: Laboratory and field studies. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 143(6):409–418.

Lind, B. B., Karro, E. 1995. “Stormwater infiltration and accumulation of heavy metals in roadside green areas in Göteborg, Sweden,” *Ecological Engineering*, 5, 533-539.

Maniquiz, M., S. Lee, L. Kim. 2010. Long-Term Monitoring Of Infiltration for Nonpoint Source Pollution Control. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*. 212(1):13-26.

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.

Mikkelsen, P., M. Häfliger, M. Ochs, P. Jacobsen, J. Tjell. 1997. Pollution of soil and groundwater from infiltration of highly contaminated stormwater-a case study. *Water Science & Technology* 36: 325-330.

Passeport, E., W.F. Hunt, D.E. Line, R.A. Smith, and R.A. Brown. 2009. Field study of the ability of two grassed bioretention cells to reduce stormwater runoff pollution. *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering* 135(4):505–510. Ramsey, C.G. & H. R. Sleeper. 1988. *Architectural Graphic Standards* (Eighth Ed.), Somerset, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Pitt, R., S. Clark, R. Field. 1999. Groundwater contamination potential from stormwater infiltration practices. *Urban Water* 1:217-236.

Scholes, L. M. Revitt, J. Ellis. 2007. A systematic approach for the comparative assessment of stormwater pollutant removal potentials. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88(2008): 467–478.

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.

Stander, E.K., and M. Borst. 2010. Hydraulic test of a bioretention media carbon amendment. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 15(6):531–536.

Tetra Tech (Tetra Tech, Inc.). 2014. *Low Impact Development Handbook Stormwater Management Strategies* County of San Diego Department of Public Works by Tetra Tech, Inc., San Diego, CA.

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.

Winer, R. 2000. *National Pollutant Removal Database for Stormwater Treatment Practices* (2nd edition). Ellicott City: Center for Watershed Protection

Winiarski, T., J. Bedell, C. Delolme, Y. Perrodin. 2006. The impact of stormwater on a soil profile in an infiltration basin. *Hydrogeology Journal* 14: 1244–1251.

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.