

A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia

Date: November 2020

Document Control Sheet

Report title	A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia	
Suggested report reference	Dalrymple B, Wicks M. (2020). A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia. Prepared on behalf of Ocean Protect.	
Authors	Brad Dalrymple, Michael Wicks.	
Date	November 2020	
Synopsis	This report provides an analysis of the application of Filterra® biofiltration systems as a stormwater treatment asset within Australia.	

Executive Summary

Over recent decades, the implementation of stormwater control measures (SCMs) to achieve a more 'water sensitive' urban environment and reduce the hydrologic and water quality impacts of urban development has increased across Australia (and overseas) (Ma et al 2019, Hermawan et al 2019, Dalrymple et al 2018). Biofiltration systems (also called biofilters, bioretention basins, bioretention systems, bioswales and raingardens) are the most commonly used SCM given their flexible design, space efficiency and applicability at a variety of scales (Water By Design 2014).

A Filterra[®] biofiltration system is very similar to a 'typical' biofiltration system (using 'sandy loam' filter media). A key difference, however, is that Filterra® biofiltration systems utilise a filter media blend that can treat flows at a significantly higher flow rate than typical biofiltration filter media. Filterra® biofiltration systems can also achieve local stormwater pollution reduction targets with significantly less area (typically 0.3% of upstream area) relative to typical biofiltration systems (with 'sandy loam' media, typically 0.8 to 1.5% of upstream area).

This report provides a review of the performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems, and of their suitability for application within Australia. This review has shown that Filterra® biofiltration systems are an appropriate stormwater treatment asset type for application in Australian urban environments for both privately and publicly owned areas. This finding considers a range of factors, including the following:

- **Government approvals:** Filterra® biofiltration systems are accepted by local Governments in Australia and by over 500 jurisdictions in the USA, including a number of key states with the highest stormwater quality requirements.
- Government approvals and case studies: There are approximately 9000 examples of Filterra® systems in the USA, and five areas within Australia where they have been integrated. Stormwater treatment performance monitoring has been undertaken for three of these systems (including one in Australia at Western Sydney) operating in 'real world' conditions, all showing significant reductions in pollutant concentrations. The performance testing at the Western Sydney site demonstrated that the Filterra® biofiltration system was able to achieve significant reductions in stormwater pollutant concentrations, with a concentration efficiency ratio (ER) for total suspended solids (TSS), total phosphorus (TP) and total nitrogen (TN) of 81, 83 and 49% respectively (from a total of seventeen qualifying events) after the 12-month establishment period.
- Compliance with biofiltration requirements in Australia: Filterra® biofiltration systems comply with the majority of the recommendations for biofiltration systems in Australia, as specified by guidelines published by the Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water By Design (2014). The key difference is the saturated hydraulic conductivity of Filterra® biofiltration systems (3550mm/hour), which is considerably higher than the guideline recommended range of 100 to 300mm/hour. Filterra® filter media has, however, been optimised to operate under these high flow rates while maintaining pollutant removal performance, and appropriately supporting vegetation.

- Peer reviews: Three (3) separate peer reviews have been undertaken in relation to the applicability of Filterra® biofiltration systems as a stormwater improvement device within Australia, including specific regions within Victoria and Queensland. These peer reviews were undertaken by Professor Ataur Rahman from the University of Western Sydney, Ralf Pfleiderer from RPEC, and Damian McCann from AWC. All peer review reports advise that Filterra biofiltration systems are a suitable stormwater treatment asset for Australian conditions. Mr Pfleiderer and Mr McCann have also confirmed that monitoring undertaken (up to April 2020) complied with *Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol* (Stormwater Australia, 2018 Version 1.3) and the City of Gold Coast's "*Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices*" (April 2015) and that treatment performance monitoring of Filterra biofiltration systems should be modelled within MUSIC using the bioretention treatment node, with appropriate properties in accordance with the recommendations outlined in Table 3-1 of this report.
- Life cycle cost analyses: Life cycle cost analyses have been undertaken for an example 'typical' development land usage scenario using an extensive database of cost information for Filterra® biofiltration systems and other Ocean Protect SCMs and available cost data (from Melbourne Water (2013)) on 'typical' biofiltration systems and wetlands excluding land costs for the stormwater treatment asset types assessed. The analyses show that Filterra® biofiltration basins were likely the second most cost-effective stormwater treatment scenario assessed (with the second lowest equivalent annual payment per unit of pollution removed per year) likely more cost effective than typical wetlands, and typical 'at source' bioretention rain gardens and tree pit systems (but likely less cost effective than typical bioretention basins).

It is recommended that the treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems be modelled within MUSIC using the bioretention treatment node, with appropriate properties (as outlined in Table 3-1). This has been based on a review of modelling options (within MUSIC), and a comparison of actual treatment performance monitoring results (as observed at a case study at Western Sydney, NSW, Australia) and modelling predictions (using the MUSIC bioretention treatment node). In this example, the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) provided a reasonable estimate of the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems – with MUSIC predicted ER's of 91, 80 and 47% for TSS, TP and TN respectively, compared to observed ER's (from site monitoring) of 80, 83 and 49% respectively. This assessment subsequently indicates that the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) may provide a reasonable estimate for the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems that the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) may provide a reasonable estimate for the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems that the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) may provide a reasonable estimate for the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems.

It should, however, be noted that (as outlined in Table 3-1), a Filterra® biofiltration system with a filter area equal to 0.3% of the upstream catchment is likely to provide optimal treatment performance. Whilst MUSIC may indicate a Filterra biofiltration system with a smaller area than 0.3% of the upstream catchment may be able to achieve given stormwater quality objectives, it is recommended that a Filterra® biofiltration size of 0.3% of upstream catchment be applied.

Contents

Exec	utive	Sum	mary	i
1	Intro	ducti	on	1
	1.1	Back	ground	1
	1.2	Biofilt	ration systems	1
	1.3	Filteri	a [®] biofiltration systems	3
	1.4	Repo	rt objectives	3
2	Revi	ew of	Suitability of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia	4
	2.1	Prear	nble	4
	2.2	Rese	arch and development	4
	2.3	Gove	rnment approvals	4
	2.4	Case	studies	6
	2.5	Treat	ment performance monitoring	11
	2.6	Comp	liance with requirements for biofiltration systems in Australia	12
	2.7	Peer	reviews	15
		2.7.1	Peer review by Professor Ataur Rahman	15
		2.7.2	Peer review by Ralf Pfleiderer	16
		2.7.3	Peer review by Damian McCann	16
	2.8	Life c	ycle costs	17
	2.9	Conc	usion	17
3	Mod	elling	Filterra® treatment performance	18
	3.1	Prear	nble	18
	3.2	Mode	lling software	18
	3.3	Treat	ment node options	18
		3.3.1	Bioretention	18
		3.3.2	Media filtration	21
		3.3.3	Generic treatment	22
	3.4	Reco	mmendation	22
4	Cone	clusic	on and a second s	23
5	Refe	rence	es	24
Арре	endix	Α	Frequently Asked Questions	A-1
Appendix B Stormwater treatment performance for a high flow rate biofiltration system at Western Sydney, Kingswood, NSW		B-1		

Appendix C	MUSIC modelling of Filterra® biofiltration system at University of Western Sydney	C-1
Appendix D	Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Professor Ataur Rahman	D-1
Appendix E	Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Ralf Pfleiderer	E-1
Appendix F	Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Damian McCann	F-1
Appendix G	Cost Abatement Analyses for Filterra® Biofiltration Systems and Other Stormwater Treatment Asset Types	G-1
Appendix H	Results of Filterra® filter media sampling & analyses	H-1
Appendix I	Filterra® filter media nutrient concentrations for MUSIC Modelling	I-1

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Components of a typical biofiltration system	1
Figure 2-1	Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Warwick Farm	
Figure 2-2	Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Silverdale (immediately after planting)	8
Figure 2-3	Example photos of Filterra $^{I\!\!R}$ biofiltration systems at Western Sydney, Old Beach, Cammeray and Gold Coast	9
Figure 2-4	Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Caloundra (immediately after planting)	10
Figure B-1	Aerial photo of the site, catchment and equipment	B-2
Figure B-2	Example photo of the car park	B-2
Figure B-3	Example photos of the Filterra $\ensuremath{\mathbb{B}}$ biofiltration system and sampling facilities at the site	B-3
Figure B-4	Schematic plan drawing of Filterra® biofiltration system at site	B-4
Figure B-4	Schematic section drawing of Filterra® biofiltration system at site	B-5
Figure B-5	Time series of site rainfall and timing of sampling events	B-9
Figure B-6	Plots of recorded influent and effluent concentrations at the site	B-14
Figure B-7	Box plots of recorded influent and effluent concentrations at the site	B-15
Figure C-1	Layout of MUSIC model for site	C-3
Figure G-1	Example layout of MUSIC model used in cost abatement analyses	G-3
Figure G-2	Graph of calculated acquisition costs for modelled scenarios	G-6
Figure G-3	Graph of calculated maintenance and renewal costs for modelled scenarios	G-6
Figure G-4	Graph of calculated life cycle costs for modelled scenarios	G-7

Figure G-5	Graph of calculated EAP for TSS removal for modelled scenarios	G-7
Figure G-6	Graph of calculated EAP for TP removal for modelled scenarios	G-8
Figure G-7	Graph of calculated EAP for TN removal for modelled scenarios	G-8

List of Tables

Table 1-1	Key processes involved in the removal or transformation of stormwater pollutants within biofiltration systems	2
Table 2-1	Summary of Councils within Queensland and Victoria that have confirmed 'no objection' to use of Filterra® biofiltration systems	
Table 2-2	Summary of recent case studies of Filterra® biofiltration systems in Australia	6
Table 2-3	Summary of recent treatment performance monitoring case studies of Filterra® biofiltration systems	11
Table 2-4	Comparison of recommended values for Filterra® biofiltration systems against CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water By Design (2014) recommended criteria	12
Table 3-1	Recommended bioretention treatment node properties for Filterra® biofiltration systems and from Healthy Land and Water (2018)	20
Table A-1	Recommended plant species for Filterra® biofiltration systems	A-1
Table B-1	Summary of required field testing protocol at site	B-6
Table B-2	Water quality analytical parameters and methods for the site	B-8
Table B-3	Summary of recorded rainfall and flow data for site	B-10
Table B-4	Results of treatment performance monitoring	B-11
Table B-5	Concentration reduction efficiencies	B-12
Table B-6	Statistical summary of monitoring results	B-13
Table B-7	Influent nitrogen speciation percentages	B-13
Table B-8	Comparison of site influent and effluent concentrations and values from Anderson et al (2018) and Herrera (2014)	B-16
Table B-9	Comparison of site influent EMC and Smolek (2018) EMCs with MUSIC guideline EMC values	B-16
Table B-10	Comparison of site influent % dissolved nitrogen with E2DesignLab (2015) recommended values	B-17
Table B-11	Comparison of site influent nitrogen speciation with runoff data for other sites within Australia and E2DesignLab (2015) recommended values	B-17
Table B-12	Comparison of performance monitoring data during and after first twelve months	B-17
Table C-1	Summary of source node properties applied in modelling	C-1
Table C-2	Summary of treatment node properties applied in modelling	C-2

Table C-3	Comparison of Predicted Average Annual Flows and Loads for Site against observed concentration efficiency ratio (1 June 2019 to 31 August 2020)	C-3
Table C-4	Comparison of recorded influent and effluent concentrations recorded at site and as predicted by MUSIC (1 June 2019 to 31 August 2020)	C-4
Table G-1	Operational Phase Performance Criteria	G-2
Table G-2	Treatment node properties for modelled scenarios	G-2
Table G-3	Applied life cycle costing properties	G-3
Table G-4	Summary of life cycle cost values for modelled scenarios	G-4
Table G-5	Summary of life cycle cost results for modelled scenarios	G-5
Table H-1	Summary of locations for Filterra® filter media sampling and analyses	H-1
Table H-2	Water quality analytical parameters and methods for the site	H-1
Table H-3	Summary of Filterra® biofiltration system filter media test results	H-2

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

It is commonly understood that unmitigated urban stormwater is a key contributor to reduced water quality and waterway health in Australia and internationally. Traditional urban development and associated stormwater drainage practices of conveying stormwater runoff to waterways as efficiently as possible (providing minimal opportunities for treatment and reuse) have been recognised as being unsustainable and inappropriate due to changed catchment hydrology (e.g. increased frequency and volume of stormwater flows) and increased stormwater pollutant loads to waterways and associated ecological impacts.

Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) is an internationally recognised concept that offers an alternative to traditional development practices, providing a holistic approach to the design of urban development that aims to minimise the negative impacts on the natural water cycle and protect the health of waterways (South East Queensland Healthy Waterways Partnership 2006). Over recent decades, the implementation of stormwater control measures (SCMs) to achieve a more 'water sensitive' urban environment and reduce the hydrologic and water quality impacts of urban development has increased across Australia (and overseas) (Ma et al 2019, Hermawan et al 2019, Dalrymple et al 2018).

1.2 **Biofiltration systems**

Biofiltration systems (also called biofilters, bioretention basins, bioretention systems, bioswales and raingardens) are one of the most commonly used SCMs within Australia given their flexible design, space efficiency and applicability at a variety of scales (Water By Design 2014). Key components of a typical biofiltration system are illustrated in Figure 1-1.



Figure 1-1 Components of a typical biofiltration system

The key function of biofiltration systems is to remove pollutants from stormwater (Water By Design 2014). Stormwater entering these systems percolates through the plant/ mulch/ soil environment and is treated through a variety of physical, chemical and biological processes before being discharged to groundwater or collected via slotted or perforated pipes and discharged to downstream drainage systems and/ or waterways. Key processes involved in the removal or transformation of stormwater pollutants are summarised in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1	Key processes involved in the removal or transformation of stormwater pollutants within
	biofiltration systems

Stormwater pollutant	Key treatment processes
Sediment	Settlement during pondingPhysical filtration by media
Nitrogen	 Nitrification Denitrification Biotic assimilation by plants and microbes Decomposition Physical filtration of sediment-bound fraction Adsorption
Phosphorus	 Physical filtration of sediment-bound fraction Adsorption Biotic assimilation by plants and microbes Decomposition
Heavy metals	 Biotic assimilation by plants and microbes Physical filtration of sediment-bound fraction Oxidation/reduction reactions
Pathogens	 Adsorption-desorption Physical filtration by media Die-off (either natural or due to competition or predation)
Organic micropollutants*	AdsorptionBiodegradation

*: Hydrocarbons, pesticides/herbicides, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), phenols, phthalates

Source: Payne et al (2015)

Biofiltration systems also reduce the frequency and volume of runoff discharged to downstream waterways via a combination of evapotranspiration and infiltration, mitigating the hydrologic changes due to urbanisation and associated impacts (e.g. scour/ erosion).

The filter media is a key component of a biofiltration system, providing the important roles of removing pollution and supporting vegetation. Within Australia, the Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water by Design (2014) are likely the most suitable guidelines in relation to the selection of suitable filter media for biofiltration systems.

The eWater CRC MUSIC software is commonly used to model the generation, transport and treatment of stormwater flows and pollutant loads. Guidelines outlining the recommended procedures for its application in Australia, including the modelling of biofiltration system performance include those prepared by Water By Design (2010b), BMT WBM (2015) and Melbourne Water (2016).

1.3 Filterra[®] biofiltration systems

A Filterra[®] biofiltration system is very similar to a typical biofiltration system (using 'sandy loam' filter media). A key difference, however, is that Filterra® biofiltration systems utilise a filter media blend that can treat flows at a significantly higher flow rate than typical biofiltration filter media and the media is produced to strict quality control procedures. Filterra biofiltration systems can achieve local stormwater pollution reduction targets with significantly less area (typically 0.3% of upstream area) relative to typical biofiltration systems (with 'sandy loam' media, typically 0.8 to 1.5% of upstream area).

1.4 Report objectives

The objectives of this report are to provide the following:

- A review of the suitability of Filterra® biofiltration systems within Australia
- A review of the methods for modelling the treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems (and, if appropriate, identify a recommended method).

2 Review of Suitability of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia

2.1 Preamble

This section provides a review of the suitability of Filterra® biofiltration systems for Australian conditions, based on the following aspects:

- Research and development
- Government approvals
- Case studies
- Treatment performance monitoring
- Compliance with requirements for biofiltration systems in Australia
- Peer review
- Life cycle costs.

2.2 Research and development

The design and implementation of Filterra® biofiltration systems has been developed by Contech based on more than twenty years of research and development, testing and field monitoring (Contech 2016).

2.3 Government approvals

Filterra® biofiltration systems are accepted by the majority of local Governments in Australia. Table 2-1 provides a summary of Councils within Queensland and Victoria that have confirmed that they have 'no objection' to the use of Filterra® biofiltration systems, noting that any proposed system requires approval on a project-specific basis.

Council	Confirmed 'no objection' for use on public sites	Confirmed 'no objection' for use on private sites	Recommending modelling method in MUSIC
Queensland			
Brisbane City Council		\checkmark	Bioretention node with
Bundaberg Regional Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	accordance with Table
Cairns Regional Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	3-1
Redland City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Townsville Regional Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Sunshine Coast Regional Council		\checkmark	TBC
Victoria			
Bayside City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	Bioretention node with
Casey City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	properties in accordance with Table
Frankston City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	3-1
Greater Dandenong City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Mornington Peninsula Shire Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Whittlesea City Council		\checkmark	
Wyndham City Council		\checkmark	
Mildura City Council	\checkmark	\checkmark	

Table 2-1	Summary of Councils within Queensland and Victoria that have confirmed 'no
	objection' to use of Filterra® biofiltration systems

Filterra® biofiltration systems are also accepted by over 500 jurisdictions in the USA, including a number of key states with the highest stormwater quality requirements. Numerous field and laboratory studies have been conducted within the USA on some of the approximately 9000 systems installed. Examples of these approvals are:

- Granted ESD (Environmental Site Design) status by the State of Maryland Dept of Environment (MDE).
- GULD-approved for TSS, Phosphorus, Heavy Metals, and Oil & Grease with the state of Washington Dept of Ecology (WA-Ecology).
- TAPE field tests completed under WA-Ecology requirements.
- Total third-party-protocol field/pilot tests include (1) TARP, (2) TAPE, (1) NJCAT and (1) NCDENR tests completed
 - TARP = Technology Acceptance Reciprocity
 - TAPE = Technology Acceptance Protocol Ecology (State of Washington Dept of Ecology)

- NJCAT = New Jersey Corporation for Advanced Technology (New Jersey Dept of Environment)
- NCDENR = North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources

2.4 Case studies

There are approximately 9000 examples of Filterra® biofiltration systems in USA. Details of several of these systems are available at <u>https://www.conteches.com/knowledge-center/case-studies</u>.

Table 2-2 provides examples of case studies of Filterra® biofiltration systems in Australia, with example photos provided in Figure 2-1, Figure 2-2, Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4.

 Table 2-2
 Summary of recent case studies of Filterra® biofiltration systems in Australia

Location	Site details	Date of installation
Warwick Farm racecourse, Sydney, NSW	 Two 'basin' systems (area 120 and 140m² each) 	November 2017
Western Sydney, NSW	• Single 'tree pit' system (area 1.45m ²)	April 2018
Silverdale, NSW	 Two 'basin' systems (area 530 and 258 m² each) 	• June 2020
Cammeray, NSW	• Single basin system (area 6m ²)	• June 2018
Old Beach, Tasmania	 Four 'tree-pit' systems (area 1.44m² each) Additional 5 systems to be installed in next stage 	• June 2018
Gold Coast, QLD	 One system (area 13m²), treating recirculated late water only 	April 2019
Caloundra, QLD	Three systems (area 10, 12 and 12 m ² each)	September 2020



Figure 2-1 Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Warwick Farm



Figure 2-2 Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Silverdale (immediately after planting)



Figure 2-3 Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Western Sydney, Old Beach, Cammeray and Gold Coast



Figure 2-4 Example photos of Filterra® biofiltration systems at Caloundra (immediately after planting)

Section 2.5 and Appendix B describes the treatment performance monitoring of the case study at Western Sydney. Whilst treatment performance monitoring has not been undertaken of the other systems within Australia, the qualitative results of inspections and monitoring of these systems indicates that they are exhibiting appropriate vegetation growth and overall vitality which is indicative of a healthy biofiltration system achieving its design intent of improving water quality.

2.5 Treatment performance monitoring

Table 2-3 provides a summary of three recent examples of Filterra® biofiltration systems operating in 'real world' conditions where treatment performance monitoring has been undertaken.

Location	Site details	Methodology summary	Performance summary	Further information
North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA	 2.2m² system (0.22% of catchment) 1000m² catchment (car park, 100% impervious) Mean rainfall 1049mm per year 	 Monitored by North Carolina University 22-month monitoring period (2013-14) 34 sampling events Influent & effluent analysed for solids, nutrients and metals Flow-rates and volumes measured 	 81, 55 and 40% TSS, TP and TN load removal respectively 92, 54 and 33% TSS, TP and TN mean concentration reduction respectively 56% median peak flow reduction 6% of unaccounted runoff volume loss 	 Anderson et al (2015) Smolek et al (2018) Appendix B
Bellingham, Washington, USA	 2.2m² system (0.22% of catchment) 1000m² catchment (residential) Mean rainfall 885mm per year 	 Monitored by Herrera Environmental Consultants Influent & effluent analysed for solids, phosphorus, copper, zinc, pH and particle size distribution Flow-rates and volumes measured 	88% and 70% TSS and TP concentration reduction respectively	 Herrera (2014) Appendix B
Western Sydney University, Kingswood, NSW, Australia	 1.45m² system (0.34% of catchment) 420m² catchment (car park, 100% impervious) Mean rainfall 717mm per year 	 Monitored by Ocean Protect 27-month monitoring period (June 2018 to September 2020) 28 sampling events (17 events after first 12 months of operation) Influent & effluent analysed for solids and nutrients 	 77, 74 and 42% TSS, TP and TN mean concentration reduction respectively (for all data) 81, 83 and 49% TP and TN mean concentration reduction respectively following the first 12 months of operation (for the 17 events in this period) 	Appendix B

 Table 2-3
 Summary of recent treatment performance monitoring case studies of Filterra® biofiltration systems

It should be noted that volume reduction was not recorded for the Western Sydney site. Some flow reductions at the Western Sydney site, however, would have likely occurred – for example, due to soil storage and evapotranspiration. It is anticipated that the flow reductions for the Western Sydney site would be similar to those observed at the North Carolina site (average of 6% volumetric losses).

2.6 Compliance with requirements for biofiltration systems in Australia

As outlined in Section 1.2, within Australia, CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water by Design (2014) are likely the most suitable guidance in relation to the recommended criteria for biofiltration systems. Water By Design (2014) largely requires compliance with CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and additional aspects. Table 2-4 provides a comparison of recommended biofiltration system specifications as outlined in CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water By Design (2014) against specification values for Filterra® biofiltration systems.

Table 2-4Comparison of recommended values for Filterra® biofiltration systems against
CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water By Design (2014) recommended criteria

Parameter	Filterra®	Guideline recommendation		Filterra®	Comments
	biofiltration systems	CRC WSC (2015)	Water By Design (2014)	biofiltration system compliance with guidelines	
Pre-treatment					
Requirement	Consistent with CRC WSC (2015) and Water By Design (2014)	 Recommended, except in the case of: Biofilters that only receive roof runoff; Biofilters with catchments < 2 ha without identifiable sediment sources; Biofiltration swales. 	 None for roof runoff only or for catchments ≤ 2-ha Vegetated swale, coarse sediment forebay, inlet pond, or gross pollutant trap for catchments > 2 and ≤5- ha Catchments > 5-ha, inlet pond or gross pollutant trap 	Yes	
Storage properties		1	· ·	1	I
Extended detention depth	≤ 300mm	100 to 300mm	≤ 300mm	Yes	
Vegetation					
Species	A range of plant species are appropriate, consistent with the recommendations of CRC WSC (2015) and Water By Design (2014). See Table A-1 for recommended planting palette within Australia.	CRC WSC (2015) outlines desirable plant traits for biofiltration systems and a list of recommended plant species.	Water By Design (2014) provides a list of recommended plant species.	Yes	Locally specific recommended planting palettes for Filterra® biofiltration systems are available upon request.

Organic mulch layer					
Organic mulch layer	Approx. 75mm deep layer.	Recommended to generally avoid its usage.	50 to 75mm deep layer	Yes for Water By Design (2010). No for CRC WSC (2015)	Our experience indicates that this mulch layer is critical to the function of biofiltration systems (e.g. providing pre-treatment of solids, augmenting plant health). Mulch for Filterra® systems is tested for leaching, floatability, fertility and hydraulic capacity to ensure proper flow characteristics for permeability and water retention, and to ensure pollutant discharge does not occur and that no materials are present that could harm the vegetation.
Filter media					
Type (general)	Consists of gravel, sand, silt, clay and organics. Supports a range of vegetation types that are adapted to freely draining soils with occasional wetting.	Natural or amended soils or entirely engineered media, that can support a range of vegetation types that are adapted to freely draining soils with occasional wetting.	Sand and loam mix that supports vegetation growth.	Yes	Filterra® filter media has been optimised to operate under high flow rates and has been manufactured to the most rigorous Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) program of any biofiltration media.
Clay and silt content	<5%	<3%	2 to 6%	Yes	A range (<5%) is provided for Filterra® filter media as the particle size distribution is confidential.
Filter media depth	Approx. 530mm	Typically ranging from 400 to 600mm, with 800mm recommended for tree planting.	Minimum of 400mm, and a minimum of 700mm for trees	Yes for systems without trees. No for systems with trees.	Filterra® systems with trees apply only small tree species, shown to thrive at this filter depth.
Saturated hydraulic conductivity	3550mm/hour (minimum design target)	100 to 300mm/hour (typical)	100 to 300mm/hour	No	Filterra® filter media has been optimised to operate under high flow rates while maintaining pollutant removal performance, and appropriately supporting vegetation.
Total Nitrogen (TN) content	ca. 200	<1000mg/kg	Refers to FAWB (2009), which is	Yes	Appendix H provides test results for Filterra® filter media.
Orthophosphate content	<0.1	<80mg/kg	the earlier version of CRC WSC (2015)	Yes	Appendix I describes the rationale for the recommended
Organic matter content	10%	Minimum content ≤ 5% to support vegetation	(Yes	concentrations for MUSIC modelling.
рН	5.5 to 7.5	5.5 to 7.5		Yes	
Electrical conductivity	ca. 0.034 dS/m	<1.2 dS/m		Yes	

Transition layer							
Requirement	Omitted. Top of drainage layer is approx. 50mm above the top of under- drainage.	 Can be omitted provided the top of the drainage layer is at least 100mm above the top of the under-drainage pipe and filter media and drainage layer material comply following criteria: D15(drainage layer) ≤ 5xD85(filter media) D15(drainage layer) = 5 to 20xD15(filter media) D50(drainage layer) ≤ 25xD50(filter media) D60(drainage layer) ≤ 20xD10(filter media) 			A Filterra® biofiltration system does not need a transition layer because QA processes have eliminated the need for one.		
Drainage layer							
Depth	250mm	-	> 150mm (for Type 1 and 2 systems)	Yes			
Minimum pipe cover of the gravel drainage	Approx. 50mm (typical)	≥ 50mm (where transition layer present)		Yes			
Material below the under-drainage pipe	Approx. 50mm (typical)	-	≥ 200mm	No to Water By Design (2010)			
Туре	Round gravel and pebbles.	Clean, fine aggregate, such as a 2 – 7 mm washed screenings.	Fine gravel (2- 5mm) with less than 2% fines and a minimum saturated hydraulic conductivity of 4000mm/hr.		Ocean Protect follows Filterra® QA/QC system to ensure suitability and consistency of product.		

Key findings from the comparison summarised in Table 2-4 are:

- Filterra® biofiltration systems comply with the majority of the recommendations for typical biofiltration systems, as specified in CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) and Water By Design (2014)
- The key difference is the design saturated hydraulic conductivity of Filterra® biofiltration (3550mm/hour), which is considerably higher than the guideline recommended range of 100 to 300mm/hour. As outlined above, however, Filterra® filter media has been optimised to operate under these high flow rates while maintaining pollutant removal performance, and appropriately supporting vegetation.
- For aspects where Filterra® biofiltration systems do not comply with guideline recommendations, the design of any non-conforming aspect has been developed based on significant experience in both laboratory and field-based case studies. Any of the given non-compliances with CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) or Water By Design (2014) are highly unlikely to cause any negative issues/ problems that may limit its function (or potential benefits, e.g. stormwater treatment).

Filterra® media QA/ QC Process

It should also be noted that the Filterra® media Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) process is more stringent than public domain biofiltration media supplied on projects throughout Australia. Many certifying authorities and local governments rely on bulk test certificates which may not give an accurate representation of the biofiltration media for a specific project. Sometimes, media substitutions are made to meet project deadlines or simply because contractors are not soil scientists and have not been properly trained. Issues also occur between various locations where biofiltration media is manufactured to a common specification as for example, sands mined from an old agricultural field may be high in nutrients.

Filterra® media undergoes a separate QA/QC process to alleviate these above-mentioned issues through strict testing. It is important to define QA and QC separately as, with Filterra® media, Ocean Protect ensures there is as much significance put into oversight in the sourcing and mixing of the media (uniform specification) as there is in ensuring product consistency regardless of the media location.

QA is process oriented to ensure the developed process objectives are met, and improves production to prevent issues that may occur with biofiltration media into the future (e.g. leaching of nutrient or inadequate hydraulic conductivity). QC is product oriented and designed to evaluate a specific developed product/biofiltration media to reveal any product defects prior to the installation of the media.

2.7 Peer reviews

Three (3) separate peer reviews have been undertaken in relation to the applicability of Filterra® biofiltration systems as a stormwater improvement device under typical Australian urban runoff conditions. These peer reviews were undertaken by the following personnel:

- Professor Ataur Rahman from the University of Western Sydney
- Ralf Pfleiderer from RPEC
- Damian McCann from AWC

These peer reviews are provided in Appendices D, E and F respectively, and summarised in the following sub-sections.

2.7.1 Peer review by Professor Ataur Rahman

Professor Ataur Rahman from the University of Western Sydney was commissioned by Ocean Protect to undertake a peer review in relation to the applicability of Filterra® biofiltration systems as a stormwater improvement device under typical Australian urban runoff conditions.

This peer review report is provided in Appendix D, and states that "*it is highly likely that Filterra*® *Biofiltration System will achieve hydrologic and pollutant removal performances in typical Australian urban catchments (as required by the local councils) at least at the same level found by the North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina*" (Rahman 2017). As described in Table 2-3, the Filterra® biofiltration system at the North Carolina site was recorded to achieve an average of 81, 55 and 40% reduction in TSS, TP and TN loads respectively.

This review was undertaken prior to the field study at Western Sydney. As described in Table 2-3 and Appendix B, the performance testing at the Western Sydney site demonstrated that the Filterra® biofiltration system was able to achieve significant reductions in stormwater pollutant concentrations – despite relatively low concentrations for TSS, TP and TN in incoming stormwater flows (which would be expected to decrease potential concentration reductions). These results generally correlate with the field study at North Carolina, which Professor Ataur Rahman based his review largely on.

2.7.2 Peer review by Ralf Pfleiderer

Ralf Pfleiderer of RPEC undertook a review of Filterra® biofiltration systems, with a particular focus on:

- Assessing whether performance monitoring undertaken to date (up to April 2020) compiles with the following SQIDEP (Stormwater Australia, 2018 Version 1.3) and the City of Gold Coast's "Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices" (April 2015)
- Suitability of Filterra® biofiltration systems to Victoria, Australia.

Key findings from Mr Pfleiderer's peer review report (provided in Appendix E) include the following:

- monitoring complied with the aforementioned protocols
- "appropriately designed, installed, established and maintained Filterra biofiltration systems would be expected to provide a suitable stormwater treatment function in Victorian (particularly Melbourne)"
- "The treatment performance of Filterra biofiltration systems can be modelled using MUSIC's bioretention node. The treatment node properties should be adjusted according to Table 3-1 in "A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia"".

2.7.3 Peer review by Damian McCann

Damian McCann of AWC undertook a review of Filterra® biofiltration systems, with a particular focus on:

 Assessing whether performance monitoring undertaken to date (up to April 2020) compiles with "Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol" (Stormwater Australia, 2018 Version 1.3) and the City of Gold Coast's "Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices" (April 2015) • Suitability of Filterra® biofiltration systems to Australian conditions, including the appropriateness for specific areas within Australia, including Melbourne, Brisbane, Moreton Bay Regional Council, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Toowoomba, Noosa, Townsville and Mackay.

Key findings from Mr McCann's peer review report (provided in Appendix F) include the following:

- monitoring complied with the aforementioned protocols
- "AWC have been asked to consider the applicability of the results from this trial to other regions, including Melbourne, Brisbane, Moreton Bay Regional Council, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Toowoomba, Noosa, Townsville and Mackay. It is our opinion that Filterra biofiltration systems designed, installed, established and maintained in line with the trial system and design treatable flow rates evaluated here (1.42L/s), are likely to provide stormwater treatment performance at these other locations similar with that observed at the trial site. This is probably a conservative treatable flow rate given our observation of up to 2.024L/s being treated during the trial
- "We agree with Ocean Protect's recommendation to conservatively size the Filterra system at 0.3% of contributing catchment, in accordance with Table 3-1 of the report "*A review of the application of Filterra Biofiltration Systems in Australia* (Ocean Protect, April 2020)".

2.8 Life cycle costs

As part of this report, a life cycle cost analysis has been undertaken for an example 'typical' development land usage scenario using an extensive database of cost information for Filterra® biofiltration systems and other Ocean Protect SCMs and available cost data (from Melbourne Water (2013)) on 'typical' biofiltration systems and wetlands – excluding land costs for the stormwater treatment asset types assessed. The methodology and results for this analysis are described in Appendix G.

This analysis shows that Filterra® biofiltration basins were the second most cost-effective stormwater treatment scenario (with the second lowest equivalent annual payment per unit of pollution removed per year) – likely more cost effective than typical wetlands, and typical 'at source' bioretention rain gardens and tree pit systems (but likely less cost effective than typical bioretention basins). This analysis subsequently indicates that Filterra® biofiltration basins may be a preferred asset type – particularly when space is constrained.

2.9 Conclusion

Based on the information presented in the above sections, Filterra® biofiltration systems are considered to be an appropriate stormwater treatment asset type for application in Australian urban environments for both privately and publicly owned and operated sites.

3 Modelling Filterra® treatment performance

3.1 Preamble

This section describes and assesses potential methods for modelling the treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems, and identifies the most appropriate method.

3.2 Modelling software

The Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) is a software tool that simulates the behaviour of stormwater in urban catchments. MUSIC is the preferred tool for demonstrating the performance of stormwater quality treatment systems (Water By Design 2010, BMT WBM 2015).

Within MUSIC, the user is required to specify source nodes, which represent the stormwater flow and pollutant generating areas of the site being modelled. Treatment nodes can also be included to simulate (and assess) the operation of any stormwater treatment devices (e.g. biofiltration) within the site being modelled.

3.3 Treatment node options

As outlined in the previous section, MUSIC models the performance of stormwater treatment devices using 'treatment nodes'. A range of treatment nodes are available within MUSIC. The potential treatment node options for modelling the performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems are:

- Bioretention
- Media filtration
- Generic treatment.

The following sections describe the applicability of these node types for modelling Filterra® biofiltration systems.

3.3.1 Bioretention

The 'bioretention' treatment node within MUSIC is for the modelling of biofiltration systems (described in Section 1.2) and applies significant research and guidance in relation to the performance of biofiltration systems (eWater 2014). In particular, the treatment node allows the model user to specify values for parameters known to have significant influence on the performance of biofiltration systems, including (but not limited to):

- Filter media soil type, nutrient concentrations and saturated hydraulic conductivity
- Vegetation properties
- Submerged zone presence (and properties, if applicable).

The application of the bioretention treatment node has, however, some limitations. For example, eWater (2014) states that it might be inaccurate when predicting treatment performance for systems with a filter media depth, influent pollutant concentration or submerged zone depth outside the tested range. Of particular relevance to modelling Filterra® biofiltration systems, eWater (2014) states that the model also assumes that the biofiltration filter media is sandy loam and that there is likely to be some uncertainty when systems with other types of filter media (such as sand or gravel) or other carbon sources are modelled. Nevertheless, the bioretention treatment node within MUSIC allows the model user to specify the filter media soil type (with options of 'sand', 'loamy sand', 'sandy loam', 'silt loam', 'loam') in addition to the filter media nutrient concentrations and saturated hydraulic conductivity.

Table 3-1 outlines the recommended properties for a bioretention treatment node if used to model the Filterra® biofiltration systems, and those given by Healthy Land and Water (2018) for biofiltration systems.

Table 3-1	Recommended bioretention treatment node properties for Filterra® biofiltration
	systems and from Healthy Land and Water (2018)

Parameter	Recommended value for Filterra® biofiltration systems*	Healthy Land and Water (2018) recommended value for biofiltration systems	Comments			
Inlet properties						
Low-flow bypass (m ³ /s)	User o	defined				
High-flow bypass (m ³ /s)	User o	defined				
Storage properties	-					
Extended detention depth (mm)	≤ 300mm 300mm					
Surface area	User	defined				
Filter and media properties						
Filter area (m ²)	User o	A Filterra® biofiltration system with a filter area equal to 0.3% of the upstream catchment is likely to provide optimal treatment performance.				
Unlined filter media perimeter (m)	User-o					
Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hour)	3550	200 (but also run 50 mm/hr for sensitivity and present results)				
Filter depth (m)	0.53	0.4 to 1.0m (typically 0.5- 0.6m)				
Total Nitrogen (TN) content (mg/kg)	500	User defined (use 400 mg/kg if unknown)	See Appendix H and Appendix I for information			
Orthophosphate content	1	User defined (use 300 mg/kg if unknown)	relevant to recommended values for Filterra® biofiltration systems.			
Infiltration properties						
Exfiltration rate (mm/hr)	Exfiltration rate (mm/hr) User defined					
Vegetation properties						
Plant selection	User defined ('vegetated w recomm					
Outlet properties						
Overflow weir width (m)	User defined	Typically greater than or equal to surface area (m²)/10				
Underdrain present	Yes	Typically Yes				
Submerged zone with carbon present	No	User defined				
Depth (of submerged zone) - User defined						

*: Peer reviews for Filterra® biofiltration systems undertaken by Ralf Fleiderer and Damian McCann (provided in Appendices E and F respectively) refer to Table 3-1 of the April 2020 version of this report. The recommended properties for Filterra® biofiltration systems outlined in the April 2020 version of this report are identical to those given above.

As outlined above, it is recommended that any Filterra® biofiltration systems modelled in MUSIC apply parameter values consistent with given design parameters and consistent with Healthy Land and Water (2018) guideline values for biofiltration systems.

Appendix C describes the methodology and results of modelling a Filterra® biofiltration system at Western Sydney as a bioretention treatment node (in MUSIC), with comparisons made between MUSIC predictions and monitoring data recorded at the site. In this example, the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) provided a reasonable estimate of the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems – with MUSIC predicted ER's of 91, 80 and 47% for TSS, TP and TN respectively, compared to observed ER's (from site monitoring) of 80, 83 and 49% respectively. The assessment indicates that the application of MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) may provide a reasonable estimate for the stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems.

3.3.2 Media filtration

The media filtration node within MUSIC has been set up to account for filtration systems (both proprietary and non-proprietary) which operate in such a way that they are not properly represented by other MUSIC treatment nodes (Water By Design 2010, Healthy Land and Water 2018).

This treatment node is similar to the bioretention node in MUSIC, with two components for stormwater treatment – in the storage over the filter media, and within the filter media itself. Pollutant removal through the filtration medium is modelled using empirical equations derived from analysis of data published in the technical literature (eWater 2014). This node is nearly identical to the previous MUSIC Version 3 bioretention node, and when Version 3 models are imported into Versions 5 and, the user selects the Version 3 bioretention nodes to be upgraded, the media filtration node is used. This is done to ensure a similar performance between Version 3 and Version 5/ 6 models, however does not account for improved understanding regarding the performance of biofiltration systems (integrated into the bioretention treatment node in MUSIC Version 5 and 6) (eWater 2014)

eWater (2014) states that the data supporting the predicted performance of media filtration systems comes from a range of studies around the world, including systems for gravel, sand and soil, some of which include vegetated systems, but advise that "where possible, data derived from the specific type of system to be used should be used to the calibrate the media filtration node", which "can be done by editing the parameters of the pollutant removal equations" but should only be done using data from "published, peer-reviewed studies".

eWater (2014) also states that "when a vegetated filtration system is to be configured in MUSIC ... it is strongly recommended that the bioretention node is used". Given that Filterra® biofiltration systems are vegetated filtration systems and can be appropriately modelled as a bioretention node (with parameter values adjusted as appropriate, in accordance with Table 3-1), it is likely more appropriate to model Filterra® biofiltration systems as a bioretention node (relative to the media filtration node).

3.3.3 Generic treatment

Generic treatment nodes require the user to specify the pollutant reduction rates (under 'Transfer Functions') and are commonly applied to model the performance of proprietary SCMs (e.g. StormFilter®, Jellyfish®). This node does not have any storage/ detention component, but this can be approximately represented by using a separate treatment node (e.g. sedimentation basin) upstream of the generic treatment node.

For this method, the most appropriate method to model a Filterra® biofiltration system (or any biofiltration or media filtration system) would include a combination of the following:

- Sedimentation basin treatment node, with storage properties to representant the storage/ detention component (e.g. zero permanent pool depth). The pollutant decay characteristics of the treatment node could be adjusted, if appropriate.
- Generic treatment node, which would receive the flow and pollutant time series from the detention node. Pollutant removal through the filter media (and within the storage component, if appropriate) would be defined by adjusted pollutant reduction transfer functions. Flows exceeding the filter media could be accounted for by specifying a high flow bypass rate within this node, or by incorporating an appropriate secondary drainage link.

For generic treatment nodes, Water By Design (2010) states that "authorities should not accept models which use the pollutant reduction function unless the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed treatment measure operates in a manner which cannot be represented using one of the other MUSIC treatment nodes". Given that (as described in Section 3.3.1), the operation of Filterra® biofiltration systems can be represented using the bioretention treatment node, the application of a generic treatment node (as a single node or in combination with another node) to represent Filterra® biofiltration systems would be inconsistent with the aforementioned recommendations from Water By Design (2010).

3.4 Recommendation

It is recommended that the treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems be modelled within MUSIC using the bioretention treatment node, with appropriate properties (as outlined in Table 3-1). It should, however, be noted that (as outlined in Table 3-1), a Filterra® biofiltration system with a filter area equal to 0.3% of the upstream catchment is likely to provide optimal treatment performance. Whilst MUSIC may indicate a Filterra biofiltration system with a smaller area than 0.3% of the upstream catchment may be able to achieve given stormwater quality objectives, it is recommended that a Filterra® biofiltration size of 0.3% of upstream catchment be applied.

This recommendation is consistent with the advice given in the peer review reports provided by Ralf Pfleiderer and Damian McCann (provided in Appendices E and F respectively), and summarised in Sections 2.7.2 and 2.7.3 respectively.

4 Conclusion

This report has provided a review of the performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems, and of their suitability for application within Australia. This review has included the following:

- Overview of case studies of Filterra® biofiltrations systems and associated Government approvals
- Comparison of Filterra® biofiltration systems with requirements for typical biofiltration systems, in accordance with Australian guideline recommendations
- Review of treatment performance monitoring for Filterra® biofiltration systems operating in 'real world' conditions, including a site in Western Sydney, NSW, Australia
- Peer reviews undertaken in relation to the applicability of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Professor Ataur Rahman from the University of Western Sydney, Ralf Pfleiderer from RPEC, and Damian McCann from AWC.
- Review of life cycle costs for Filterra® biofiltration systems for an example scenario, with comparisons made to other stormwater treatment asset types.

This review has shown that Filterra® biofiltration systems are an appropriate stormwater treatment asset type for application in Australian urban environments for both privately and publicly owned and operated sites.

It is recommended that the bioretention treatment node (in eWater's MUSIC software) be applied in modelling the performance of these systems, with appropriate properties (as outlined in Table 3-1).

5 References

Anderson A, Smolek A (2015). *Filterra® Bioretention System Water Quality and Hydrologic Field-Scale Performance Evaluation*. Prepared for Contech Engineering Solutions.

BMT WBM (2015). *NSW MUSIC Modelling Guidelines*. Prepared for Greater Sydney Local Land Services.

Contech (2016). *Filterra*® *Bioretention System – Solutions Guide*.

Dalrymple B, Coathup C, Coathup J, Penhallurick B, 2018. *Point Break for the WSUD Asset Wave*. Presented at Ozwater 2018, Melbourne, Australia.

Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (2017). *State Planning Policy*. Queensland Government.

Drapper D, Lucke T (2015). *Characterisation of Stormwater Pollutants from Various Catchment types in South-east Queensland*. Presented at the 2015 WSUD & IECA Conference.

E2DesignLab (2015). Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices on the Gold Coast. Prepared for the City of Gold Coast, 2015, Originally Prepared by DesignFlow. Peer Reviewed and Amended by E2DesignLab.

eWater (2014). MUSIC by eWater User Manual.

Facility for Advancing Water Biofiltration (FAWB) (2009) *Stormwater Biofiltration Systems: Adoption Guidelines.* Monash University, Melbourne.

Glaister, B.J., Cook P.L.M., Fletcher, T. D., and Hatt, B. E. (2013). *Long-Term Phosphorus Accumulation in Stormwater Biofiltration Systems at the Field Scale*. Presented at the 2013 WSUD Conference, Gold Coast.

Hatt, B.E., Fletcher and T. D., Deletic, A. (2009). *Hydrologic and pollutant removal performance of stormwater biofiltration systems at the field scale*, Journal of Hydrology, 365, 310-321.

Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (2017). *Fact Sheet – Latest discount rate for use in local development contributions plans*, August 2017.

Healthy Land and Water (2018). *MUSIC Modelling Guidelines (Consultation Draft),* Healthy Land and Water Limited, Brisbane, Queensland.

Hermawan A. A., Talei A., Salamatinia B., Chua L. H. C., 2019. *Seasonal performance of stormwater biofiltration system under tropical conditions*, Ecological Engineering, 143, 2019.

Herrera Environmental Consultants (2014). *Technical Evaluation Report – Filterra® System Phosphorus Treatment and Supplemental Basic Treatment Performance Monitoring*. Prepared for Americast Inc.

Hunt, W., Jarrett, A. R., Smith, J. T., & Sharkey, L. J. (2006). Evaluating Bioretention Hydrology and Nutrient Removal at Three Field Sites in North Carolina. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 132(6), 600-608.

Lenhart J, Hills M (2015). *The Use and Verification of Micro Bioretention Systems in the United States*, 9th International Water Sensitive Urban Design Conference and 3rd International Erosion Control Association Conference, Sydney, Australia, 2015.

Length L, Dugopolski (2010), *Filterra® Bioretention Systems: Technical Basis for High Flow Rate Treatment and Evaluation of Stormwater Quality Performance*, Prepared for Americast, Inc.

Lucke, T., & Nichols, P. W. B. (2015). *The pollution removal and stormwater reduction performance of street-side bioretention basins after ten years in operation*. Science of The Total Environment, 536, 784-792.

Ma Y., Deilami K., Egodawatta P., Liu A., McGree J., Goonetilleke A., 2019. *Creating a hierarchy of hazard control for urban stormwater management*. Environmental Pollution, 255, 1, 2019.

Melbourne Water (2016). *MUSIC Guideline – Recommended input parameters and modelling approaches for MUSIC users.*

McKenzie-McHarg, A., Smith, N. and Hatt, B. (2008). *Stormwater Gardens to Improve Urban Stormwater Quality in Brisbane*.

Payne, E.G.I., Hatt, B.E., Deletic, A., Dobbie, M.F., McCarthy, D.T. and Chandrasena, G.I., (2015). *Adoption Guidelines for Stormwater Biofiltration Systems*, Melbourne, Australia: Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities.

Parker, N. (2010). Assessing the Effectiveness of Water Sensitive Urban Design in Southeast *Queensland*. Thesis submitted towards Masters of Engineering. Queensland University of Technology.

Peljo, L., Dubowski, P., & Dalrymple, B. (2016). *The Performance of Streetscape Bioretention Systems in South East Queensland*. Paper presented at Stormwater Australia 2016 conference, Sydney.

Smolek A P, Anderson A R, Hunt W F (2018). *Hydrologic and Water-Quality Evaluation of a Rapid-Flow Biofiltration Device*. Journal of Environmental Engineering 144(2), February 2018.

Stormwater Australia (2018). *Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol*. Version 1.3, December 2018.

Taylor G D, Fletcher T D, Wong T H F, Breen P F, Duncan H P, *Nitrogen Composition in Urban Runoff – Implications for Stormwater Management.* Water Research, 2005, Vol 39, pp 1982-1989.

Water By Design (2010a). *Construction and Establishment Guidelines: Swales, Bioretention systems and Wetlands*. Brisbane: South East Queensland Healthy Waterways Partnership.

Water By Design (2010b). *MUSIC Modelling Guidelines*. Brisbane: South East Queensland Healthy Waterways Partnership.

Water By Design (2012). *Maintaining Vegetated Stormwater Assets* (Version 1), Healthy Waterways Ltd, Brisbane.

Water By Design (2014). *Bioretention Technical Design Guidelines (Version 1)*. Healthy Waterways Ltd, Brisbane.

Appendix A Frequently Asked Questions

This appendix outlines frequently asked questions regarding the application of Filterra® biofiltration systems in Australia, and responses prepared by the authors of this report. These questions have been derived from consultation from stormwater professionals in private industry and government.

Question: What is different about Filterra® bioretention media that allows high flow rates ?

The key differences are the components of the media blend, the entire media manufacturing, and system delivery process. Ocean Protect are confident that there is no biofiltration media that is made to the same or even remotely similar standards anywhere (within Australia and overseas) and is as consistent with the design specifications under operating conditions.

Question: Is the given saturated hydraulic conductivity for Filterra® biofiltration systems a typical value for a new installation or for an 'older' system (that has been operating for several years, accounting for some blockage, etc) ?

For design/ modelling purposes, it is recommended that the design saturated hydraulic conductivity for Filterra® biofiltration systems is 3550mm/hour. This is a conservative value, and we would expect higher values in typical systems. The design saturated hydraulic conductivity (3550mm/hour) is slightly above our lower 95th percentile saturated hydraulic conductivity of approximately 3300mm/hour. Based on longer-term field monitoring, we would expect typical values (for systems that have been operating for several years or more) to be approximately 4500mm/hour.

Question: The high flow rates of the Filterra® biofiltration systems suggest a very low percentage of smaller particles, which may have implications for moisture retention and plant growth. Are you able to provide further detail on particle size distribution of the Filterra® filter media ?

We are unable to provide a breakdown of the media particle size except for what is already provided in Table 3-1 (i.e. clay and silt content <5%).

Some of the media components do aid in retaining moisture and we have a recommended plant palette (see Table A-1) that lends itself to drier soil types, and we are looking to expand the existing recommended plant list.

Question: Is there anything in the Filterra® filter media (or other components of a typical Filterra® biofiltration system) that is potentially hazardous or harmful to human or environmental health ?

No.

Question: What sort of flow retention (and 'losses') are expected in Filterra® biofiltration systems ?

The predicted average annual water retention for Filterra® biofiltration systems within Australia is approximately 5% when using trees/shrubs (and not grasses). Slightly higher retention is expected in systems with grasses, which Ocean Protect are currently investigating.

Ocean Protect are also investigating the potential for Filterra® biofiltration systems to include a 'wicking' system that will store additional water to passively irrigate (i.e. without power supply or pumps) vegetation – and, ultimately, increase the real volumetric loss from the Filterra® biofiltration system (if preferred).

Question: Is it possible to reduce the peak flow rate discharged from Filterra® biofiltration systems ?

Peak flow rates out of any Filterra® biofiltration system can be decreased by restricting ('throttling') the outlet of the Filterra biofiltration system. This is not typically a concern given systems are largely focussed on managing (and providing treatment to) small/ frequent rainfall events, but this can be done reasonably easily.

Question: What information is available on the lifespan of the Filterra® biofiltration media (or how long will the media last) ?

Filterra® biofiltration systems are expected to be capable of achieving pollutant removal efficiencies and system longevity on par with conventional (slow flow rate) bioretention systems (with 'sandy loam' media). The major challenge to the longevity of the Filterra® biofiltration system is sediment build-up on the surface of the Filterra® biofiltration system, which could restrict free flow of runoff, trash and debris into the system. Provided routine maintenance is performed, the Filterra® system will theoretically last indefinitely, since it essentially sequesters and recycles nutrients, metals, and organics in the biomass (i.e., plant and microbes) (Length et al 2010).

There are systems that have been monitored in North America for the past 15 years from varying land-use with varying degrees of maintenance. All these system indicate a life span in excess of the 15 years, however, with the sacrificial mulch layer (that is highly effective at screening out a large proportion of the solids before flows flow into the filter media layer), we would expect a lifespan either the same or in excess of typical biofiltration systems.

Question: What are the typical installation and ongoing costs of a Filterra® biofiltration system ?

The typical installation cost for a typical Filterra® biofiltration system is approximately \$800/m² (cost per square metre of biofiltration filter media). This cost includes installation of the media (and mulch and vegetation) and the first twelve (12) months of maintenance. For the supply media alone, the cost is approximately \$1500/m³.

The typical ongoing maintenance cost for a typical Filterra® biofiltration system is approximately \$60/m² per annum (cost per square metre of biofiltration filter media). Ocean Protect also provide 'long term asset management' plans where the system can be essentially 'leased' (with zero or reduced initial costs, provided a long term maintenance agreement with Ocean Protect is applied).

It is worth noting that whilst the biofiltration media is different for Filterra® biofiltration systems, Ocean Protect also recommend a different approach to the design, implementation and management for the systems. Many failures of 'typical' (sandy loam) biofiltration system are due to due to variations in either design, media supply, construction and/ or lack of maintenance. Ocean Protect can provide a complete turnkey solution from design, supply, installation together with a minimum 12 months maintenance of every Filterra® biofiltration system.

Question: What are the typical maintenance activities required for a Filterra® biofiltration system ?

Like any stormwater treatment asset, the function and stormwater treatment performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems is highly dependent on these assets being appropriately managed. As required for typical biofiltration systems, typical maintenance activities for Filterra® biofiltration systems includes overall system inspection, pruning of vegetation (as required) and removal of litter. The mulch layer for Filterra® biofiltration systems also should be replaced approximately every 6 to 12 months.
Litter and sediment accumulate on the top of the mulch and this material is easily removed and typically disposed to landfill. Fresh double-shredded hardwood mulch is then placed on top of the filter media (to an approximate depth of 75mm, as per Table 2-4) and not removed until the next maintenance visit. Hardwood mulch is a highly effective and an inexpensive pretreatment layer that protects not only the filter media but also the vegetation.

Question: What are the technical limitations to applying Filterra® biofiltration systems ?

Like all biofiltration/retention systems, baseflow and high sediment loading will adversely affect the system, which Ocean Protect consider as part of every design. Ocean Protect also design the larger Filterra® biofiltration systems in segments (or individual 'cells') even though there is no theoretical limitation on system size.

The only real limitations would be the fixed media depth of 530mm and plant selection. Filterra® biofiltration systems already have a lower hydraulic impact than traditional biofiltration system (with sandy loam filter media) as the system typically has a lower ponding depth and no need for a transition layer in the media.

Question: How big is a typical Filterra® biofiltration system ?

Within Australia, it is recommended that Filterra® biofiltration systems have a filter area equal to 0.3% of the upstream catchment. This system size is typically sufficient to achieve the local stormwater quality management targets. A reduced size may be possible if pretreatment of flows (e.g. by a swale, wetland) is present upstream of the Filterra® biofiltration system.

A typical Filterra® biofiltration system is subsequently significantly smaller than a typical biofiltration system (with sandy loam filter media), which typically needs to be approximately 0.8 to 1.5% of the upstream catchment area to achieve local stormwater quality management targets.

Question: Does Filterra® biofiltration systems require a mulch layer ?

As outlined in Table 2-4, this mulch layer is critical to the function of biofiltration systems, providing pretreatment and protection of the engineered filter media, augmenting within-storm unit treatment processes (e.g. inert filtration and reactive filtration). The mulch layer also helps to retain moisture in the Filterra® system, which supports vegetation.

Question: Does the mulch float and/ or leach nutrients?

Filterra® biofiltration systems include a 3-inch (approx. 75mm) layer of double-shredded hardwood mulch above the filter media surface. As outlined in Table 2-4, the mulch for Filterra® biofiltration systems is tested for a range of aspects, including leaching, floatability, fertility, and hydraulic capacity to ensure proper flow characteristics for permeability and water retainage, and to ensure pollutant discharge does not occur, and that no materials are present that could harm the vegetation..

We do not recommend alternative mulches (e.g. sugarcane mulch, pebbles) sometimes applied in conventional (slow rate, sandy loam) biofiltration systems.

Question: Can I apply different depths for the Filterra® biofiltration system than recommended ?

Table 2-4 and Table 3-1 outline recommended depths for the extended detention depth (\leq 300mm, which includes the recommended 75mm layer of mulch), filter media depth (530mm) and drainage layer (250mm). We do not recommend applying smaller depths for the mulch, filter media and drainage layer.

The extended detention depth can be reduced to 75mm (to only include the mulch layer) given the high drainage rate of the filter media (and subsequent reduced need to temporarily store inflows above the filter media). Similarly, it is possible to apply a larger extended depth (higher than the recommended maximum of 300mm) in some cases (e.g. for systems integrated within detention basins).

It is best to liaise directly with Ocean Protect personnel to discuss site specific constraints and potential design solutions.

Question: Does the monitoring of Filterra® biofiltration systems comply with SQIDEP (Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol) from Stormwater Australia and City of Gold Coast's SQID Protocol ?

The monitoring undertaken to date satisfies all technical aspects of the SQIDEP (V1.3) and City of Gold Coast (April 2015) testing protocols. This has been confirmed by two separate peer reviews by Ralf Pfleiderer and Damian McCann (provided in Appendices E and F respectively), and summarised in Sections 2.7.2 and 2.7.3 respectively. Additional information regarding compliance with the aforementioned protocols can be provided, upon request.

Question: Where is the Filterra® media produced ?

For Australian projects, Filterra® media is produced in an Ocean Project facility at Alexandria, NSW.

Question: Is there an alternative supplier of Filterra® media besides Ocean Protect ?

Within Australia, Ocean Protect is currently the sole producer/ provider of Filterra® biofiltration media. Filterra® biofiltration media is also available from Contech Engineered Solutions (headquarters in Ohio, USA). Ocean Protect anticipates that alternative suppliers of high flow rate biofiltration media will also be available within Australia in approximately 5 to 10 years.

Question: If Ocean Protect ceases operations, where can I get Filterra® media from ?

Ocean Protect (formerly known as 'Stormwater360 Australia') has been in operation for over fifteen (15) years, and the likelihood of ceasing operations is very low. Nevertheless, as outlined above, Filterra® biofiltration media is also available from Contech Engineered Solutions (headquarters in Ohio, USA).

Question: What plants are suitable for Filterra® biofiltration systems ?

Table A-1 outlines the recommended plant species across the filter media of Filterra® biofiltration systems within Australia. Ocean Protect are planning to expand this plant list in the near future.

Frequently Asked Questions

Common Name	Scientific Name	Plant Type	Sun	Drought Tolerance (1 Wet, 5 Hardy)	Height (m)	Spread (m)	Region/Distribution	Comments
Prickly Moses	Acacia ulicifolia	Small Shrub	Full/Shade	5 - Well Drained	3	2	N Qld, NSW, Vic, Tas	Not readily available.
Lilly Pilly	Acmena smithii	Evergreen Tree	Full/Shade	5 - Once Established	6	6	Coastal N Qld to Vic	Cultivars may be hedges.
Swamp Banksia	Banksia robur	Evergreen Shrub	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	2	2	East Coast	Endemic to Australia. Check regional suitability.
Boronia	Boronia microphylla	Evergreen Shrub	Part	3 - Moist Preferred	1	1	East Coast	95 spp endemic to Australia.
Soft Boronia	Boronia mollis	Evergreen Shrub	Full/Part	4 - Moist Preferred	1.5	1.5	Far North Coast NSW	protected sites.
Pinnate Boronia	Boronia pinnata	Evergreen Shrub	Part	2 - Moist	1.5	1.5	East Coast NSW	
(Dwarf) Weeping Bottlebrush	Callistemon viminalis	Evergreen Shrub/Tree	Full	5 - Once Established	1.5-2	2	Eastern Australia	Many cultivars, region suited
(Dwarf) Crimson Bottlebrush	Callistemon citrinus	Egreen Medium Shrub	Full/Part	4 - Moist/Dry	2	2	NSW Coastal	Many cultivars, P tolerant
Bottlebrush	Callistemon 'Little John'	Evergreen Shrub	Full/Part	4 - Moist/Dry	1	1.5	Eastern Australia	Many cultivars region suited
NSW Christmas Bush	Ceratopetalum gummiferum	Egreen Large Shrub	Full/Part	4 - Moist/Dry	<5	<5	NSW Coastal	Pruning possible to limit size
White Correa	Correa alba	Evergreen Shrub	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	1.5	1.5	NSW, Vic Coastal	Other spp regionally suited
Pink Wax Flower	Eriostemon australasius	Evergreen Shrub	Part	2 - Moist	1.5	1.5	Far North Coast NSW	Other spp SEQ - hardy cultivars
Grevillea	Grevillea 'Robyn Gordon'	Evergree Shrub	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	1.5	2	Widespread	Many regional suited cultivars
Hakea	Hakea myrtoides	Dwarf Shrub	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	1	1	Widespread	Many Hakea spp available that may provide better
								regional suitability
Manuka/Tea Tree	Leptospernum scoparium	Shrub/Small Tree	Full/Part	4 - Moist/Dry	2.5	2.5	Cooler Climate	Many spp & cultivars suited to different habitats

Frequently Asked Questions

Paperbark/Tea Tree	Mellaleuca stypheloides	Shrub/Small Tree	Full/Part	3 - Moist Preferred	3	1.5	Widespread	Many different spp & cultivars suited to a variety of climatic conditions
Native Daphne	Pittosporum undulatum	Tree	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	12	7	East Coast of NSW but is capable of very adapting to a range of climates	Usually smaller as a cultivar. Considered a weed in some States and regions within Australia.
Powderpuff Lilly Pilly	Syzygium wilsonii	Shrub/Small Tree	Full/Part	4 - Moist/Dry	2-6	2-3	Nth Coastal, WA, Qld, NT & NSW	Regional hybrids have been developed.
Riberry, Cherry Alder, Small Leaved Lilly Pilly	Syzygium Iuehmannii	Shrub/Small Tree	Full/Part	5 - Once Established	7	3	Sub-tropical, Nth NSW to Nth Qld.	Hardy plant that may be used to form a hedge.
Swamp Foxtail Grass	Pennisetum alopecuroides	Grass	Full/Frost	5 - frost, poor soils and innundation.	1	0.6		This species self-seeds readily and can become invasive.
Tall Sedge	Carex appressa	Grass	Full	5	1.2	0.5	Australia-wide	tough densely tufted sedge. Full sun, boggy conditions, fast growing, long lived, very hardy
Spiny headed mat rush 'lush green'	Lomandra longafolia	Grass	Full/Part	5 - Frost / Low Water/Drought	0.8	1.2	NSW, Vic, Qld, WA, SA, Tas	Large perennial tussock grass with strong architectural shape. Forms dense tussocks of stiff, long flat leaves
kangaroo grass	Themeda australis	Grass	Full/Part	4 - drought conditions	0.4	0.3	Australia-wide	Densely tufted small perennial tussock forming grass with attractive seed heads

NOTE: The plants listed herein have been selected as a general subjective guide to assist in the selection of species (spp)/ cultivars, which would be suitable for use in Filterra® biofiltration systems. The use of Common Names to describe specific plants can be misleading. Wherever possible, it is recommended to use the Scientific Name when describing a specific plant. Further many other specific spp/ cultivars exist for each genus and local nurseries/horticulturalists/Botanic Gardens should be consulted regarding the suitability of specific plants to local soil and climatic conditions. Other considerations include site specific weather patterns and climate (wind, frost etc) and the suitability of the soil/media for specific plant species especially in Australia where most plants have evolved in low Phosphorus soil conditions or soils that have a high acidity or alkalinity.

Appendix B Stormwater treatment performance for a high flow rate biofiltration system at Western Sydney, Kingswood, NSW

B.1 Preamble

As outlined in Section 2.5, stormwater treatment performance monitoring has been undertaken for a Filterra® biofiltration system at Western Sydney, NSW, Australia. This appendix describes the methodology and results of that assessment.

B.2 Background

As outlined in Section 2.4, there are approximately 9000 Filterra® biofiltration systems in USA, including two systems that have undergone extensive monitoring at (i) North Carolina and (ii) Bellingham, Washington.

The Filterra® biofiltration system described by Smolek et al (2018) was monitored by North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA during a 22-month period between 2013 and 2014. This system was 1.2m x 1.8m and located within a parking lot of an Amtrak[™] train station, with an upstream catchment of approximately 1000m² of impervious asphalt and concrete.

The Filterra® biofiltration system described by Herrera Environmental Consultants (2014) was monitored for Americast Inc in the City of Bellingham, Washington. The system was 1.2m x 1.8m and located downstream of a 1620m² catchment, with a primarily medium density single-family residential land usage in the catchment. The system was installed in 2007, with monitoring undertaken between January and July 2013.

Whilst Filterra® systems have also been installed at locations within Australia, there had previously been no treatment performance monitoring at a 'real world' site within Australia. Study authors and the Engineering Department of the Western Sydney University subsequently developed and implemented a Filterra® biofiltration system to assess its performance within Australia.

B.3 Methodology

B.3.1 Site details

The site is located at a car park in Western Sydney, Kingswood, NSW, Australia (hereafter referred to as 'the site'). The car park is swept periodically, but minor amounts of sediment and organic debris are typically present at the car park. The carpark consists entirely of an impervious asphalt surface and has a high usage rate.

An aerial photo of the site from January 2018 is shown in Figure B-1. An example photo of the car park is provided in Figure B-2.



Figure B-1 Aerial photo of the site, catchment and equipment



Figure B-2 Example photo of the car park

A Filterra® biofiltration system was installed at the southern edge of the car park. The system receives runoff from an area of 420m² (which is 100% impervious), determined by land survey and site inspections. The catchment is illustrated in Figure B-1.

The Filterra® biofiltration system was installed at the site in April 2018. The system has a total area of 1.45m² (0.34% of catchment) and 0.53m depth of Filterra® filter media, with a design treatable flow rate of 1.42 L/s. Slotted pipes are located within a gravel surround (immediately below the Filterra® filter media).

Example photos of the Filterra® biofiltration system are provided in Figure B-3. A schematic of the system is provided in Figure B-4.



Figure B-3 Example photos of the Filterra® biofiltration system and sampling facilities at the site



Figure B-4 Schematic plan drawing of Filterra® biofiltration system at site



Figure B-5 Schematic section drawing of Filterra® biofiltration system at site

The Filterra® biofiltration system at the site has been maintained in accordance with typical/ standard maintenance procedures for these asset. In summary, the system is maintained approximately every twelve (12) months, with the most recent maintenance on 13 February 2020. Specific maintenance activities that have been undertaken have been: inspection of Filterra® biofiltration system and surrounding area; temporary removal of tree grate to access filter media surface; removal of debris, litter and mulch; mulch replacement; and plant health evaluation and pruning, as necessary.

B.3.2 Sampling design

The equipment and sampling techniques used for this study were in accordance with the Project Plan developed by Ocean Protect in consultation with both City of Gold Coast's (2016) *Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices* and Stormwater Australia's (2018) *Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol Field Monitoring*. The Project Plan generally satisfied most conditions outlined in both field testing protocols detailed below in Table B-1.

Criteria	Requirement
Minimum number of aliquots	> 8
Minimum storm coverage	> 50% of storms have >70% hydrograph coverage
Antecedent dry period	> 6 hours
Minimum Rainfall Depth	minimum required to take a composite sample
Minimum Storm Duration	5 minutes

Ocean Protect personnel were responsible for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the sampling equipment. Ocean Protect personnel provided sample retrieval, system reset, and sample submittal activities. Water sample processing and analysis was performed by ALS and Western Sydney University.

A small shipping container was provided, installed, maintained, and operated by Ocean Protect personnel for sampling purposes. The shipping container is a fully enclosed, self-contained stormwater monitoring system, specially designed and built by Ocean Protect for remote, extended-deployment stormwater monitoring. The design allows for remote control of sampling equipment, eliminates confined space entry requirements, and streamlines the sample and data collection process and operation of the equipment.

Influent and effluent water quality samples were collected using individual ISCO 6712 Portable Automated Samplers configured for 9.5 litre wide-mouth carboy bottles with disposable sample liners for sample collection. The samplers were connected to two parallel 12V DC batteries recharged with a solar panel mounted to the roof of the shipping container. The influent sampler was equipped with an ISCO 730 Bubbler Weir module, connected directly to the ISCO 6712 sampler, and installed within a pre-configured and calibrated 152mm diameter Thel-Mar Weir for flow measurement of treated effluent and sample pacing. Initially, a ISCO 750 Bi-Directional Area Velocity Flow Module with a Low Profile Area Velocity Flow Sensor was connected to the ISCO 6712 effluent sampler for total flow analysis and effluent sample pacing. Within the first 6 months, the ISCO 750 Module was removed and replaced with another ISCO 730 Bubbler Weir module installed within a 203mm diameter Thel-Mar Weir for total flow analysis. Flow rates were recorded every minute.

The bubblers were regularly checked for calibration by submersing the weir in water and setting the depth on the sampler with the bubbler module to the depth measured. The tables for the flow against height are provided by Thel-mar and input into the samplers.

Rainfall was measured at 1-minute intervals using two (2) 0.25mm resolution ISCO 674 tipping bucket-type rain gauges, securely installed on the container and regularly inspected. The sample intake for each automated sampler was connected to a stainless steel sample strainer (9/16" diameter, 6" length, with multiple 1/4" openings manufactured by ISCO) via a length of 3/8" ID Acutech Duality PTFE tubing. The rain-gauge is factory calibrated and does not require further calibration except to ensure there is nothing obstructing or interfering with the tip bucket. The rain gauge was installed and maintained according to manufacturer's instructions, and checked and cleared of debris regularly. The rain gauge was located on the shipping container and protected from excessive wind velocities that could skew accuracy of measurement. The two (2) rain gauges were installed approximately 1 m apart and results were compared periodically to ensure accuracy.

Sample strainers and flow measurement equipment were secured to the invert of the influent and effluent pipes using stainless steel spring rings with all components supplied and setup in general accordance with ISCO's guidelines. Each sampler was also connected to an ISCO 6712Gi Global Digital Cell Phone Modem (two) to allow for remote communication and data access. Effluent samples were sampled prior to mixing effluent flows with any bypass flows.

Samplers were programmed to enable the sampling program to trigger on flow. Once enabled, the samplers collected flow-proportional samples allowing the specified pacing volume to pass before taking a sample. The sample collection program was a one-part program developed to maximize the number of water quality aliquots/samples collected as well as the coverage of the storm event for an anticipated rainfall depth. Influent and effluent sample collection programs were configured to collect a minimum of eight aliquots per bottle. Due to the variability among precipitation events, the sample pacing specifications were varied in consultation with the most up-to-date precipitation forecasts and remotely programmed by Ocean Protect personnel prior to all storm events.

Following a precipitation event, Ocean Protect personnel communicated with the automated sampling equipment to confirm sample collection and then dispatch personnel to retrieve the samples and reset the automated sampling equipment. Samples where then split using the appropriately sized Bel-Art's Churn Splitter – one for the influent and one for the effluent to reduce the likelihood of contamination and to provide subsamples in accordance with the manufacturer's guidelines. Sub-samples were delivered to ALS (a NATA-accredited laboratory) on ice (<4° C) and accompanied by chain-of-custody documentation and analysis was carried out in accordance with Table B-2.

Parameter	Abbreviation	Analytical method	Limit of Reporting
Ammonia as N	Amm.N	APHA 4500 NH3 G	0.01 mg/L
Nitrate + Nitrite as N	NOx	APHA VCI3 reduction 4500 NO3- + NO2-B	0.01 mg/L
Nitrate as N	-	APHA VCI3 reduction 4500 NO3- + NO2-B	0.01 mg/L
Nitrite as N	-	APHA 4500 NO2 I	0.01 mg/L
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) as N	TKN	APHA 4500 Norg – D + APHA 4500 NH3-G	0.1 mg/L
pH (pH units)	рН	APHA 4500 H+ - B	0.01 pH units
Phosphorus Total as P	TP	APHA 4500 P - F	0.01 mg/L
Filtered Total Phosphorous as P	Ortho-P	APHA 4500 P - F	0.01 mg/L
Phosphorus Reactive as P	DP	APHA 4500 P – F	0.01 mg/L
Solids - Suspended Solids - Standard level	TSS	APHA 2540 D	5 mg/L

 Table B-2
 Water quality analytical parameters and methods for the site

B.3.3 Sampling events

The Filterra® biofiltration system was monitored between May 2018 and September 2020, with a total of twenty eight (28) qualifying runoff events recorded during this period. A total of seventeen (17) events qualifying events were recorded following the first 12-months of system 'establishment' (i.e. the first 12 months following system installation, when the planted vegetation is undergoing significant growth and the system is not fully operational). Figure B-6 illustrates the timing of the sampling events compared to a time series of rainfall data recorded at the site, noting the sampling equipment was taken off-line between March and May 2019 due to suspected herbicide contamination, which resulted in significant plant die-off during this time. Table B-3 also provides a summary of recorded rainfall at the site and flow discharged from the system.



Figure B-6 Time series of site rainfall and timing of sampling events

Event Date	Max. rainfall intensity (mm/hr)	Mean rainfall intensity (mm/hr)	Total rainfall (mm)	Total runoff volume (L)	Peak flow (L/s)	Mean flow (L∕s)	Sampling duration (hr)	Sampling coverage (%)	Number of aliquots
19 Jun 2018	0.50	0.090	1.1	745	0.226	0.011	13.7	80%	25
28 Jun 2018	10.16	0.884	8.4	2313	0.577	0.068	2.5	58%	23
26 Aug 2018	2.54	0.087	2.5	565	0.210	0.005	22.3	98%	38
3 Sep 2018	2.54	0.104	1.3	450	0.178	0.010	5.2	99%	22
20 Oct 2018	30.48	0.595	5.3	1507	2.024	0.047	2.0	99%	35
7 Nov 2018	5.08	0.347	7.4	2616	0.350	0.034	14.2	84%	50
15 Nov 2018	5.08	0.330	3.3	1060	0.423	0.029	3.0	100%	28
21 Nov 2018	5.08	0.188	2.5	445	0.194	0.009	6.5	99%	12
27 Nov 2018	38.10	2.249	65.8	15421	2.024	0.146	22.2	100%	105
19 Dec 2018	38.10	1.954	20.1	5385	1.731	0.146	3.3	39%	50
20 Dec 2018	106.68	2.513	20.1	2798	2.024	0.097	1.0	91%	50
3 Jun 2019	7.62	0.642	12.7	4856	1.003	0.068	12.8	100%	68
16 Jun 2019	12.70	0.329	4.8	1814	0.958	0.034	7.6	99%	47
23 Jun 2019	7.62	0.505	6.9	2232	0.741	0.046	6.6	99%	39
4 Jul 2019	12.70	0.313	8.6	3192	0.913	0.032	20.6	23%	32
5 Oct 2019	10.16	0.469	5.1	765	0.461	0.020	3.8	99%	18
11 Oct 2019	12.70	0.864	10.4	2436	1.146	0.056	5.0	99%	41
26 Nov 2019	15.24	0.215	1.5	210	0.538	0.008	0.1	93%	6
16 Jan 2020	17.78	0.641	17.0	4652	1.146	0.049	19.5	78%	50
24 Jan 2020	17.78	0.560	7.6	1786	1.196	0.036	6.6	89%	28
18 Feb 2020	43.18	1.321	10.4	2168	2.024	0.076	0.9	98%	72
25 Mar 2020	88.90	2.631	45.2	7058	2.024	0.114	20.3	82%	80
29 Apr 2020	81.28	2.077	21.8	3812	2.024	0.101	20.3	83%	45
21 Jun 2020	25.40	0.712	8.9	1787	1.731	0.040	20.3	54%	35
10 Jul 2020	7.62	0.238	6.1	822	0.194	0.009	20.3	67%	28
7 Aug 2020	10.16	0.725	12.4	2387	0.278	0.039	20.3	99%	36
9 Aug 2020	22.86	1.031	29.7	6874	0.577	0.066	20.3	99%	44
20 Sep 2020	12.70	0.651	8.4	7514	1.684	0.162	20.3	90%	35

 Table B-3
 Summary of recorded rainfall and flow data for site

B.4 Results & discussion

Table B-4 provides the results of the monitoring. Table B-5 provides the calculated concentration reduction efficiencies (CREs). Table B-6 provides a statistical summary of the monitoring results. Plots and box plots of recorded influent and effluent concentrations are also provided in Figure B-7 and Figure B-8. Table B-7 also provides the influent nitrogen speciation percentages. Table B-8 provides a comparison of influent and effluent concentrations recorded at the site against values recorded for two Filterra® biofiltration systems at North Carolina and Bellingham outlined in Section 2.5. Table B-9 also provides a comparison of influent EMC values recorded at the site, to those recorded at the North Carolina site by Smolek et al (2018) and those given in MUSIC modelling guidelines within Australia by Water By Design (2010), BMT WBM (2015) and Melbourne Water (2018). Table B-10 provides a comparison of the percentage fraction of total nitrogen as dissolved nitrogen against that recommended in the E2DesignLab (2015) report *Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices on the Gold Coast.* Table B-11 also provides a comparison of influent nitrogen speciation data for the site with runoff data for other sites

within Australia and E2DesignLab (2015) recommended values. Table B-12 provides a comparison the of performance monitoring data during and after the first twelve months of operation (noting that the first twelve months of operation the system is 'establishing', i.e. planted vegetation is undergoing significant growth and system is not fully operational).

Event Date	TSS (mg/L) Influent	TSS (mg/L) Effluent	DP (mg/L) Influent	DP (mg/L) Effluent	TP (mg/L) Influent	TP (mg/L) Effluent	NOx (mg/L) Influent	NOx (mg/L) Effluent	NH₃ (mg/L) Influent	NH₃ (mg/L) Effluent	DIN (mg/L) Influent	DIN (mg/L) Effluent	TKN (mg/L) Influent	TKN (mg/L) Effluent	TN (mg/L) Influent	TN (mg/L) Effluent
19 Jun 2018	36.0	13.0	0.030	0.030	0.080	0.040	0.830	0.360	0.330	0.120	1.160	0.480	0.900	0.500	1.73	0.86
28 Jun 2018	13.0	2.5	0.040	0.040	0.060	0.040	1.060	0.100	0.200	0.140	1.260	0.240	0.500	0.200	1.56	0.30
26 Aug 2018	19.0	8.0	0.110	0.020	0.170	0.050	1.130	1.170	0.690	0.200	1.820	1.370	2.200	1.100	3.33	2.27
3 Sep 2018	22.0	6.0	0.090	0.030	0.160	0.070	0.670	1.020	0.570	0.240	1.240	1.260	1.700	0.800	2.37	1.82
20 Oct 2018	60.0	12.0	0.005	0.005	0.130	0.005	1.530	0.830	0.460	0.080	1.990	0.910	1.400	0.500	2.93	1.33
7 Nov 2018	31.0	10.0	0.010	0.020	0.070	0.040	0.510	0.420	0.430	0.240	0.940	0.660	1.000	0.700	1.51	1.12
15 Nov 2018	22.0	15.0	0.020	0.020	0.110	0.070	0.670	1.260	0.520	0.300	1.190	1.560	1.200	1.000	1.87	2.26
21 Nov 2018	15.0	2.5	0.030	0.020	0.070	0.060	0.660	0.660	0.480	0.250	1.140	0.910	1.000	0.500	1.66	1.16
27 Nov 2018	52.0	10.0	0.010	0.010	0.120	0.040	0.300	0.260	0.170	0.050	0.470	0.310	0.600	0.050	0.90	0.31
19 Dec 2018	15.0	8.0	0.005	0.010	0.060	0.020	0.650	0.620	0.440	0.140	1.090	0.760	0.700	0.400	1.35	1.02
20 Dec 2018	51.0	8.0	0.005	0.005	0.190	0.050	0.860	0.620	0.470	0.200	1.330	0.820	0.800	0.300	1.66	0.92
3 Jun 2019	29.0	9.0	0.010	0.010	0.040	0.005	0.200	0.220	0.190	0.120	0.390	0.340	0.600	0.300	0.80	0.52
16 Jun 2019	16.0	2.5	0.020	0.020	0.050	0.005	0.250	0.200	0.360	0.150	0.610	0.350	0.600	0.300	0.85	0.50
23 Jun 2019	30.0	6.0	0.005	0.005	0.070	0.010	0.150	0.170	0.220	0.060	0.370	0.230	0.600	0.100	0.75	0.27
4 Jul 2019	26.0	2.5	0.030	0.005	0.130	0.020	0.610	0.200	0.470	0.030	1.080	0.230	1.200	0.300	1.81	0.50
5 Oct 2019	36.0	10.0	0.005	0.005	0.060	0.020	0.620	0.300	0.340	0.110	0.960	0.410	0.800	0.300	1.42	0.60
11 Oct 2019	90.0	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.120	0.005	0.260	0.190	0.260	0.100	0.520	0.290	0.400	0.100	0.66	0.29
26 Nov 2019	138.0	41.0	0.005	0.020	0.760	0.040	0.280	0.750	0.005		0.285	0.750	3.900	0.700	4.18	1.45
16 Jan 2020	92.0	11.0	0.020	0.005	0.290	0.050	0.700	0.840	0.760	0.410	1.460	1.250	2.300	1.300	3.00	2.14
24 Jan 2020	98.0	36.0	0.005	0.010	0.160	0.070	0.320	0.440	0.370	0.160	0.690	0.600	1.200	0.700	1.52	1.14
18 Feb 2020	13.8	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.080	0.067	0.450	0.373	0.288	0.157	0.738	0.530	0.425	0.233	0.88	0.61
29 Apr 2020	52.0	8.0	0.005	0.005	0.120	0.030	0.140	0.210	0.250	0.140	0.390	0.350	0.800	0.400	0.94	0.61
21 Jun 2020	8.0	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.005	0.060	0.060	0.120	0.060	0.180	0.120	0.200	0.050	0.26	0.11
10 Jul 2020	15.0	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.040	0.005	0.260	0.180	0.170	0.060	0.430	0.240	0.600	0.200	0.86	0.38
7 Aug 2020	11.0	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.020	0.005	0.210	0.110	0.230	0.070	0.440	0.180	0.400	0.200	0.61	0.31
9 Aug 2020	39.0	2.5	0.005	0.005	0.040	0.005	0.060	0.050	0.210	0.005	0.270	0.055	0.300	0.050	0.36	0.10
20 Sep 2020	26.0	2.5	0.040	0.005	0.080	0.010	0.005	0.060	0.010	0.005	0.015	0.065	0.300	0.100	0.31	0.16
Mean	39.1	8.6	0.019	0.012	0.123	0.031	0.487	0.424	0.333	0.135	0.820	0.554	0.965	0.414	1.45	0.84
Median	29.5	7.0	0.005	0.005	0.080	0.025	0.385	0.280	0.325	0.120	0.714	0.380	0.750	0.300	1.39	0.60

Table B-4 Results of treatment performance monitoring

*: Italicised values were recorded as below the laboratory level of reporting (LOR), and are presented as being equal to half of the LOR.

Event Date	TSS CRE%	DP CRE%	TP CRE%	NOx CRE%	NH₃ CRE%	TKN CRE %	DIN CRE%	TN CRE%
19 Jun 2018	64%	0%	50%	57%	64%	44%	59%	50%
28 Jun 2018	81%	0%	33%	91%	30%	60%	81%	81%
26 Aug 2018	58%	82%	71%	-4%	71%	50%	25%	32%
3 Sep 2018	73%	67%	56%	-52%	58%	53%	-2%	23%
20 Oct 2018	80%	0%	96%	46%	83%	64%	54%	55%
7 Nov 2018	68%	-100%	43%	18%	44%	30%	30%	26%
15 Nov 2018	32%	0%	36%	-88%	42%	17%	-31%	-21%
21 Nov 2018	83%	33%	14%	0%	48%	50%	20%	30%
27 Nov 2018	81%	0%	67%	13%	71%	92%	34%	66%
19 Dec 2018	47%	-100%	67%	5%	68%	43%	30%	24%
20 Dec 2018	84%	0%	74%	28%	57%	63%	38%	45%
3 Jun 2019	69%	0%	88%	-10%	37%	50%	13%	35%
16 Jun 2019	84%	0%	90%	20%	58%	50%	43%	41%
23 Jun 2019	80%	0%	86%	-13%	73%	83%	38%	64%
4 Jul 2019	90%	83%	85%	67%	94%	75%	79%	72%
5 Oct 2019	72%	0%	67%	52%	68%	63%	57%	58%
11 Oct 2019	97%	0%	96%	27%	62%	75%	44%	56%
26 Nov 2019	70%	-300%	95%	-168%	100%	82%	-163%	65%
16 Jan 2020	88%	75%	83%	-20%	46%	43%	14%	29%
24 Jan 2020	63%	-100%	56%	-38%	57%	42%	13%	25%
18 Feb 2020	82%	0%	17%	17%	46%	45%	28%	31%
25 Mar 2020	94%	0%	87%	-6%	81%	50%	50%	33%
29 Apr 2020	85%	0%	75%	-50%	44%	50%	10%	35%
21 Jun 2020	69%	0%	50%	0%	50%	75%	33%	58%
10 Jul 2020	83%	0%	88%	31%	65%	67%	44%	56%
7 Aug 2020	77%	0%	75%	48%	70%	50%	59%	49%
9 Aug 2020	94%	0%	88%	17%	98%	83%	80%	72%
20 Sep 2020	90%	88%	88%	-1100%	50%	67%	-333%	48%
Mean	76%	-6%	68%	-36%	62%	58%	16%	44%
Median	80%	0%	74%	9%	60%	51%	34%	46%

 Table B-5
 Concentration reduction efficiencies

*: Negative (red) values show a recorded increase in pollutant concentrations across the system.

					,		0		
Analyte	no. of events	Range of Influent EMCs (mg/L)	Median Influent EMC (mg/L)	Mean Influent EMC (mg/L)	Range of Effluent EMCs (mg/L)	Median Effluent EMC (mg/L)	Mean Effluent EMC (mg/L)	Median Conc. Removal Efficiency (Mean CRE, %)	Efficiency Ratio (ER, %)
TSS	28	8 - 138	29.5	39.1	2.5 - 41	7.0	8.6	80%	78%
DP	28	0.005 - 0.11	0.005	0.019	0.005 - 0.04	0.005	0.012	0%	37%
TP	28	0.01 - 0.76	0.080	0.123	0.005 - 0.07	0.025	0.031	74%	75%
NOx	28	0.005 - 1.53	0.385	0.487	0.05 - 1.26	0.280	0.424	9%	13%
NH3-N	28	0.005 - 0.76	0.325	0.333	<i>0.005</i> - 0.41	0.120	0.135	60%	59%
DIN	28	0.015 - 1.99	0.714	0.820	0.055 - 1.56	0.380	0.554	51%	32%
TKN	28	0.2 - 3.9	0.750	0.965	0.05 - 1.3	0.300	0.414	34%	57%
TN	28	0.26 - 4.18	1.385	1.45	0.1 - 2.27	0.60	0.84	46%	42%

 Table B-6
 Statistical summary of monitoring results

Table B-7	Influent	nitrogen	speciation	percentages
		<u> </u>		

Event Date	% of NOx as % of TN	NH_3 as % of TN	DIN as % of TN	TKN as % of TN
19 Jun 2018	48%	19%	67%	52%
28 Jun 2018	68%	13%	81%	32%
26 Aug 2018	34%	21%	55%	66%
3 Sep 2018	28%	24%	52%	72%
20 Oct 2018	52%	16%	68%	48%
7 Nov 2018	34%	28%	62%	66%
15 Nov 2018	36%	28%	64%	64%
21 Nov 2018	40%	29%	69%	60%
27 Nov 2018	33%	19%	52%	67%
19 Dec 2018	48%	33%	81%	52%
20 Dec 2018	52%	28%	80%	48%
3 Jun 2019	25%	24%	49%	75%
16 Jun 2019	29%	42%	72%	71%
23 Jun 2019	20%	29%	49%	80%
4 Jul 2019	34%	26%	60%	66%
5 Oct 2019	44%	24%	68%	56%
11 Oct 2019	39%	39%	79%	61%
26 Nov 2019	7%		7%	93%
16 Jan 2020	23%	25%	49%	77%
24 Jan 2020	21%	24%	45%	79%
18 Feb 2020	51%	33%	84%	49%
25 Mar 2020	31%	55%	86%	69%
29 Apr 2020	15%	27%	41%	85%
21 Jun 2020	23%	46%	69%	77%
10 Jul 2020	30%	20%	50%	70%
7 Aug 2020	34%	38%	72%	66%
9 Aug 2020	17%	58%	75%	83%
20 Sep 2020	2%	3%	5%	98%
Mean	33%	29%	60%	67%
Median	34%	27%	65%	66%



Figure B-7 Plots of recorded influent and effluent concentrations at the site



Figure B-8 Box plots of recorded influent and effluent concentrations at the site

Parameter	Location ¹	No. of samples	Range ²	Mean	Mean CRE
TSS	WS Influent	28	8 - 138	39.1	76
	WS Effluent		2.5 - 41	8.6	
	NC Influent	29	20 - 730	122	92
	NC Effluent		1 – 16	5	
	B Influent	22	7.5 – 138	52.2	88
	B Effluent		1.8 – 47	6.1	
TP	WS Influent	28	0.01 - 0.76	0.123	68
	WS Effluent		<i>0.005</i> - 0.07	0.031	
	NC Influent	33	0.03 – 0.59	0.132	54
	NC Effluent		<lor 0.14<="" td="" –=""><td>0.047</td><td></td></lor>	0.047	
	B Influent	24	0.031 – 0.524	0.134	70
	B Influent		0.020 - 0.090	0.040	
TN	WS Influent	28	0.26 - 4.18	1.45	44
	WS Effluent		0.10 - 2.27	0.84	
	NC Influent	34	0.35 – 2.62	0.63	35
	NC Effluent		0.26 – 2.10	0.46	
NH ₃ -N	WS Influent	28	<i>0.005</i> - 0.76	0.333	62
	WS Effluent		0.005 - 0.41	0.135	
	NC Influent	34	<lor 0.57<="" td="" –=""><td>0.16</td><td>13</td></lor>	0.16	13
	NC Effluent		<lor 0.42<="" td="" –=""><td>0.09</td><td></td></lor>	0.09	
TKN	WS Influent	28	0.2 – 3.9	0.965	58
	WS Effluent		0.05 – 1.3	0.414	
	NC Influent	34	0.34 - 2.40	0.57	44
	NC Effluent		<lor 1.40<="" td="" –=""><td>0.32</td><td></td></lor>	0.32	
NOx	WS Influent	28	0.005 - 1.53	0.487	-36
	WS Effluent		0.05 - 1.26	0.424	
	NC Influent	34	<lor -="" 0.45<="" td=""><td>0.10</td><td>-97</td></lor>	0.10	-97
	NC Effluent		<lor -="" 0.80<="" td=""><td>0.16</td><td></td></lor>	0.16	

Table B-8Comparison of site influent and effluent concentrations and values from
Anderson et al (2018) and Herrera (2014)

1: WS = Western Sydney site. NC = North Carolina site from Smolek et al (2018). B = Bellingen site from Herrera (2014) 2: Italicised values were recorded as below the laboratory level of reporting (LOR), and are presented as being equal to half of the LOR.

 Table B-9
 Comparison of site influent EMC and Smolek (2018) EMCs with MUSIC

guideline EMC values

Parameter	Site Influent (mg/L)	Smolek et al (2018) influent (mg/L)	Water By Design (2010) ¹	BMT WBM (2015) ²	eWater, Melbourne Water (2016) ³
TSS EMC	39.1	122	269	269	270
TP EMC	0.123	0.132	0.501	0.501	0.500
TN EMC	1.45	0.63	1.82	2.19	2.20

1: Values are from Event Mean Concentrations (EMCs) for 'Urban residential roads' as given by Water By Design (2010) *MUSIC Modelling Guidelines* 2: Values are for EMC for sealed roads as given by BMT WBM (2015) *NSW MUSIC Modelling Guidelines*

3: Values are default values from for urban residential for the eWater MUSIC software, which are recommended for application by Melbourne Water (2016) MUSIC Guidelines - Recommended input parameters and modelling approaches for MUSIC.

Table B-10 Comparison of site influent % dissolved nitrogen with E2DesignLab (2015) recommended values

Darameter		٤	Site	E2DesignLab (2015) ¹		
		Mean	Range	Typical	Min.	
	% fraction of TN dissolved	60%	5 to 86%	Approx. 50%	40%	

1: Values are from E2DesignLab (2015) Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices on the Gold Coast, August 2015, Internal report.

Table B-11 Comparison of site influent nitrogen speciation with runoff data for other sites within Australia and E2DesignLab (2015) recommended values

Location	NOx as a % of TN	NH₃-N as a % of TN	Organic N as a % of TN	TKN as a % of TN
Site mean	33	29	-	67
Site range	2-68	3-58	-	32-98
'Typical fraction' cited by E2DesignLab (2015)	25-40	0.1-20	45-70	55-75
'Minimum fraction' cited by E2DesignLab (2015)	20	5	-	-
Drapper et al (2015)	22	16	-	35
Parker (2010) bioretention basin	28	19	53	72
Parker (2010) wetland inlet big	26	12	68	80
Parker (2010) wetland inlet small	37	21	41	62
Taylor et al (2005) ²	36	13	52	65
Hunt et al (2006), Greensboro G1 ²	25	18	56	74
Hunt et al (2006), Greensboro G2 ²	37	16	40	56

1: Concentration values are average values unless otherwise stated

2: Source: Parker (2010)

Table B-12 Comparison of performance monitoring data during and after first twelve months

Parameter (and associated period)*	No. of events	TSS Influent (mg/L)	TSS Effluent (mg/L)	TP Influent (mg/L)	TP Effluent (mg/L)	TN Influent (mg/L)	TN Effluent (mg/L)
Mean - first 12 months	11	31	8.6	0.111	0.044	1.897	1.215
Mean - after 12 months	17	45	8.6	0.131	0.022	1.164	0.593
ER % - first 12 months	11	72	2%	60)%	36	6%
ER % - after 12 months	17	81	%	83	3%	49	1%

*: For the first twelve (12) months following installation of Filterra® biofiltration system, the system is considered to be in an 'establishment' phase, i.e. the planted vegetation is undergoing significant growth and the system is not fully operational.

Flow

The design treatable flow rate of Filterra biofiltration systems has been determined as 140inches/hour or 3550mm/hour (Herrerra 2015, Lenhart et al 2015). Five (5) of the 28 events sampled exceeded this design treatable flow rate, with a peak measurement of 5060mm/hr. Due to the limitation of the flow capacity through the 152mm Thel-Mar weir, higher flow rates through the system were unable to be qualified. The flow rate measured through the system were under a-typical operational conditions (i.e. 150mm peak hydraulic head filtering through all components of the system being the mulch layer, media layer (saturated) through to the underdrain). No mixing of bypass flows were possible to over-estimate the treatment flow rate recorded.

Suspended solids

Significant reductions in TSS concentrations were recorded for all events, with an average reduction of 76% (ranging from 32 to 97%) for all qualifying events. The median effluent EMC (8.0mg/L) was similar to the mean effluent EMC (8.8mg/L), which is consistent with all analytes measured. Particle Size Distribution analysis was completed for events three (3) events (24 January 2020, 29 April 2020 and 10 July 2020) with an average d50 of 53.6µm and 21.2µm for the influent and effluent respectively. The average d90 for the three events sampled indicates almost all particle above 100µm being removed by the Filterra® biofiltration system.

TSS concentrations in stormwater flowing from the car park catchment (and entering the Filterra® biofiltration system) were significantly lower than that recommended in given MUSIC guidelines for comparable land usages. For example, the mean and maximum TSS concentrations recorded in inflows to the Filterra® biofiltration system were 39.1 and 138mg/L, significantly lower than the guideline recommended EMC values of 269 and 270mg/L (See Table B-9). As described by Neumann et al (2010), for example, it is easier for SCMs to achieve higher pollutant concentration reduction rates when runoff has higher pollutant concentrations. Higher TSS concentrations with higher TSS influent concentrations. Therefore, higher TSS concentration reductions would be likely for Filterra® biofiltration systems receiving flows with TSS concentrations similar to values recommended in the aforementioned guidelines.

Higher TSS CREs were observed by Smolek et al (2018). This study (at North Carolina) recorded significantly higher TSS inflow concentrations (relative to the site), which (as described above) would favour higher TSS concentration reductions. The TSS inflow concentrations observed at the North Carolina site were still significantly lower than those recommended in MUSIC Guidelines, indicating that higher TSS CREs would be likely at TSS concentrations closer to guideline values.

Higher TSS CRE's were observed after the first 12 months of operation, with an average ER of 72% observed in the first 12 months, and 81% after this 12-month establishment period (following installation). This increase in TSS removal is likely (at least in part) due to enhanced filtration processes of the plant, mulch and soil environment after the 12-month establishment period.

Nutrients

Mean TP and TN concentration reductions observed across the system for all qualifying events were 68% and 44% respectively. The CRE for TP was higher than observed by Smolek et al (2018) of 54% and also marginally lower than that observed by Herrera (2014) of 70%.

TP and TN EMCs observed in flows to the Filterra® biofiltration systems at the site and by Smolek et al (2018) were significantly lower than that recommended by aforementioned MUSIC guidelines. As for TSS, the ability of any SCM to reduce nutrient concentrations would be decreased at lower inflow concentrations.

The majority of the recorded phosphorus concentrations observed in flows to and from the Filterra® biofiltration system consisted of particulate phosphorus, with relatively low concentrations of dissolved phosphorus. For nitrogen, a mean of 60% of recorded inflow concentrations were dissolved (ranging from 5 to 86%), which complies with the recommended minimum mean of 40% given by E2DesignLab (2015). The percentage of nitrogen speciation for NOx and ammonia-N comply with the recommended minimum fractions given by E2DesignLab (2015), and proportions of nitrogen species are similar to values observed at other sites (presented in Table B-11).

As observed for TSS, higher TP and TN ERs were observed after the first 12 months of operation, with average CRE's of 60 and 36% observed in the first 12 months, and 83% and 49% after this 12month establishment period. This increase in TP and TN removal is likely (at least in part) due to enhanced filtration and biological treatment processes of the plant, mulch and soil environment after the 12-month establishment period. Furthermore, nitrate influent concentrations during the 12-month establishment period and after the 12-month establishment period were 0.806mg/L and 0.280mg/L respectively. Upon installation of the plant within the Filterra® biofiltration system, all care is taken to remove as much 'potting mix' as possible which contain fertilizers that are designed to release dissolved nutrients overtime during the 12-month establishment period. It is hypothesized that this nutrient source may be the cause of this 65% decrease in average nitrate concentrations.

B.5 Conclusion

Stormwater treatment performance testing was undertaken for a Filterra® biofiltration system located in a car park at Western Sydney, NSW, Australia. The sampling and monitoring protocol was designed and implemented in consultation with both City of Gold Coast's (2016) *Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices* and Stormwater Australia's (2018) *Stormwater Quality Improvement Device Evaluation Protocol Field Monitoring*.

The performance testing at the site demonstrated that the Filterra® biofiltration system was able to achieve significant reductions in stormwater pollutant concentrations, with a concentration ER for TSS, TP and TN of 81, 83 and 49% respectively after the 12-month establishment period. These concentration reductions were achieved despite relatively low concentrations for TSS, TP and TN in incoming stormwater flows (which would be expected to decrease potential concentration reductions).

These results generally correlate with a similar assessments of Filterra® biofiltration systems in the USA described by Smolek et al (2018) and Herrera (2014), and provide further evidence of the ability of an appropriately designed, installed and operated Filterra® biofiltration system to provide a stormwater treatment function (and protect water quality within downstream waterways).

Appendix C MUSIC modelling of Filterra® biofiltration system at University of Western Sydney

C.1 Preamble

As described in Section 3.2, MUSIC is the preferred tool for demonstrating the performance of stormwater quality treatment systems (Water By Design 2010, BMT WBM 2015). As described in Section 3.3.1, Filterra® biofiltration systems can be modelled in MUSIC using a bioretention treatment node.

This appendix describes the methodology and results of modelling the Filterra® biofiltration system at Western Sydney (described in Appendix A) as a bioretention treatment node (in MUSIC), with comparisons made between MUSIC predictions and monitoring data recorded at the site.

C.2 Methodology

C.2.1 Software

The eWater CRC MUSIC software (Version 6) has been used in these assessments. This is the latest version of MUSIC (at the time of report writing).

C.2.2 Source node

Within MUSIC, the user is required to specify source nodes. The source nodes represent the stormwater flow and pollutant generating areas of the site.

A single source node was used to represent the catchment flowing to the Filterra® biofiltration system at the site. A summary of the source node properties used in the MUSIC modelling is provided in Table C-1.

Parameter	Unit	Value	Comments
Land usage classification	-	Urban residential roads	Unless otherwise stated, rainfall-runoff and pollutant export properties in accordance with Water By Design (2010)
Area	ha	0.042	See Appendix A.
Imperviousness	%	100%	
TSS/ TP/ TN EMC's	mg/L	Varies	Pollutant concentrations as recorded in site monitoring (for influent, See Table B-9). In the absence of a recorded concentration corresponding to rainfall events within the modelling event, the previous recorded concentrations available are applied for flows from the catchment (represented by the source node).
Estimation method	-	Mean	See above for assumptions related to pollutant concentrations. No stochastic generation of pollutants assumed.

Table C-1	Summary of	source node	properties	applied in	modelling
-----------	------------	-------------	------------	------------	-----------

C.2.3 Treatment node

A single bioretention node was used to represent the Filterra® biofiltration system at the site. A summary of the treatment node properties used in the MUSIC modelling is provided in Table C-2. The layout of the source and treatment nodes within MUSIC is illustrated in Figure C-1.

Parameter	Unit	Value	Comments
Inlet properties			
Low-flow bypass	m³/s	0	All flows enter system.
High-flow bypass	m³/s	100	Default value. Overflow of high flows determined by system storage.
Storage properties			
Extended detention depth	mm	150	From as-constructed drawings.
Surface area	m²	1.45	
Filter and media properties			
Filter area	m²	1.45	From as-constructed drawings.
Unlined filter media perimeter	m	N/A	Zero exfiltration assumed.
Saturated hydraulic conductivity	mm/hour	3550	Design rate.
Filter depth	m	0.53	From as-constructed drawings.
Total Nitrogen (TN) content	mg/kg	400	Based on filter media results given in
Orthophosphate content	mg/kg	0.1	Table H-3.
Infiltration properties			
Exfiltration rate	mm/hr	0	Zero exfiltration assumed.
Vegetation properties			
Plant selection	-	'vegetated with nutrient effective plants'	A single 'Bush Christmas' Lilly Pilly (<i>Syzygium australe</i>) tree is within the system. This species is not identified as a 'plant with effective nutrient removal' by CRC for Water Sensitive Cities (2015) or as 'core functional bioretention species' by Water By Design (2014). The species does, however, appear to function as a 'plant with effective nutrient removal'.
Outlet properties			
Overflow weir width	m	1.2	From as-constructed drawings.
Underdrain present	-	Yes	
Submerged zone with carbon present	-	No	

 Table C-2
 Summary of treatment node properties applied in modelling

 $\ensuremath{\text{MUSIC}}$ modelling of Filterra $\ensuremath{^{\mbox{\scriptsize B}}}$ biofiltration system at University of Western Sydney



Figure C-1 Layout of MUSIC model for site

C.2.4 Meteorological data

Modelling was performed from 1 June 2019 to 31 August 2020, using 6-minute rainfall data recorded at the site and monthly areal PET from Parramatta (provided within MUSIC). This period includes all site monitoring data (16 qualifying events) following the 'establishment' of the system, assumed to be after the first twelve (12) months of operation (noting the system was installed in April 2018).

C.3 Results

Table C-3 presents a comparison of the predicted average annual flows and pollutant loads for the site against observed concentration efficiency ratio (ER) (between 1 June 2019 and 31 August 2020). Table C-4 presents a comparison of the recorded influent and effluent concentrations at the site (as part of site monitoring, described in Table B-8). It should be noted that the pollutant concentration statistics from MUSIC are only for periods where flow was predicted in MUSIC (i.e. results exclude all periods of zero flow).

	Average annu	Observed Concentration		
Parameter	Sources	Residual	% Reduction	Efficiency Ratio (%)
Flow (ML/year)	0.267	0.264	0.9%	N/A
TSS (kg/year)	16.10	2.95	82%	80%
TP (kg/year)	0.034	0.009	72%	83%
TN (kg/year)	0.327	0.186	43%	49%
Gross pollutants (kg/year)	6.92	0	100%	N/A

 Table C-3
 Comparison of Predicted Average Annual Flows and Loads for Site against observed concentration efficiency ratio (1 June 2019 to 31 August 2020)

Table C-4 Comparison of recorded influent and effluent concentrations recorded at site and as predicted by MUSIC (1 June 2019 to 31 August 2020)

Parameter	Unit	Value predicted by MUSIC ¹	Value using site monitoring data ²
TSS mean influent concentration	-	61	46
TP mean influent concentration	ha	0.122	0.134
TN mean influent concentration	%	1.25	1.22
TSS mean effluent concentration	mg/L	5.6	9.0
TP mean effluent concentration	mg/L	0.025	0.023
TN mean effluent concentration	mg/L	0.66	0.62
TSS ER	%	91%	80%
TP ER	%	80%	83%
TN ER	%	47%	49%

1: Values are only for periods where flow was predicted (i.e. results exclude all periods of zero flow). 2: See Table B-8.

Flows

The MUSIC analysis of the period between 16 June 2018 and 18 April 2020 predicts a volumetric flow reduction of 0.9% across the Filterra® biofiltration system. Whilst flow-rates were not recorded at the Western Sydney site, this value is less than the 6% reduction in flows for the Filterra® biofiltration system observed by Smolek et al (2018).

Suspended solids

The Filterra® biofiltration system is predicted by MUSIC to result in a significant reduction in TSS loads and concentrations over the modelling period. The predicted TSS concentration efficiency ratio (ER) of 91% is higher than that recorded (of 80%). However, this predicted TSS concentration ER of 91% is similar to the recorded TSS concentration reduction of TSS concentrations of 91% as recorded by Anderson and Smolek (2015). Furthermore, the predicted average TSS load removal of 82% is similar to the concentration TSS ER of 80%, noting anticipated flow reduction would result in TSS load removal being slightly higher than concentration reductions. This indicates that MUSIC may provide an approximate estimate of TSS concentration reduction for Filterra® biofiltration systems.

Nutrients

MUSIC predicts high TP and TN load and concentration reductions across the Filterra® biofiltration system. The TP and TN concentration ER's predicted in MUSIC are slightly lower than observed in monitoring data, indicating that MUSIC may provide an approximate estimate of TP and TN concentration reductions for Filterra® biofiltration systems.

Summary

It is likely that MUSIC (and associated bioretention node) provides an reasonable prediction of TSS, TP and TN load and concentration reductions for the Filterra® biofiltration system at the site. It should, however, be noted that this comparison utilises the recorded performance data at just one site.

Appendix D Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Professor Ataur Rahman

This appendix provides the peer review of Filterra® biofiltration systems undertaken by Professor Ataur Rahman from Western Sydney University for Ocean Protect (formerly Stormwater360 Australia).

WESTERN SYDNEY UNIVERSITY

School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia Locked Bag 1797, Penrith, NSW 2751, Australia

Date 5 October 2017

Mr Michael Wicks Technical Director Stormwater 360, Australia

Dear Sir,

Please find attached a peer review report in relation to the applicability of Filterra® Bioretention System as a stormwater improvement device under typical Australian urban runoff conditions.

It has been found that Filterra® Bioretention System is highly likely to achieve hydrologic and pollutant removal performances in typical Australian urban catchments (as required by the local councils) at least at the same level found by the North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA testing (reported in Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

This conclusion has been arrived mainly based on the review of field study and test results on Filterra® carried out by North Carolina State University during 2013-14 (over 22 months) to assess its hydrologic and pollutant removal performances and comparison with similar field and laboratory testing of a number of bioretention systems in Australia.

Yours sincerely,

Samo

Associate Professor Ataur Rahman, PhD, FIE Aust., M. ASCE Water and Environmental Engineering Civil Engineering Department School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics Western Sydney University, Australia

Peer Review: StormFilter[®] as a stormwater improvement device

1. Background

Urbanisation has major negative impacts including increased flood peak & volume and deteriorated water quality. A range of stormwater treatment technologies have been developed to reduce the negative impacts of urbanisation, for example, wetlands, sedimentation ponds, infiltration systems and, more recently, bioretention systems (e.g. Davis, 2005; Wong, 2006). Bioretention systems, also known as biofilters or raingardens, are the most widely used stormwater 'best management practice' in the US (Davis et al., 2009) and becoming quite popular in other countries like Australia (Wong, 2006).

Bioretention systems typically consist of small areas which are excavated and backfilled with a mixture of high-permeability soil and organic matter to maximize infiltration and vegetative growth and are covered with native vegetation (Roy-Poirier et al., 2010). The vegetation is selected to be resistant to environmental stresses and generally include small plants and shrubs. A layer of mulch is often added to cover the soil media and retain solids. An inlet structure is built to route urban runoff from the surrounding area to the unit, while an overflow structure bypasses flows above the ponding capacity of the unit. In regions having native soils of low permeability, an underdrain structure is constructed at the bottom of the facility to prevent water from standing in the unit for extended periods of time. Biofiltration system is a recommended and increasingly popular technology for stormwater management; however, there is a general lack of performance data for these systems, particularly at the field scale (Hatt et al., 2009).

The water quality performance of bioretention systems has mainly been assessed in laboratory conditions (e.g. Bratieres et al., 2008; Lucas and Greenway, 2008). These studies generally report high removals of sediments, heavy metals and phosphorus from synthetic stormwaters. The removal of nitrogen, and particularly nitrate, has been variable with the bioretention systems (Hatt et al., 2007). Recent studies have suggested that laboratory-scale filter columns do not satisfactorily replicate field-scale conditions leading to the needs for field evaluation of bioretention systems (Hatt et al., 2008).

This review focuses on Filterra® Bioretention Systems that offers a unique version of the typical flow-through filter by coupling high volume treatment with an engineered bioretention media (e.g. 140 in/hr, equivalent to 3556 mm/hr design infiltration rate) (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

2. Review of Bioretention System

Bioretention system is an engineered stormwater control measure that provides soil and vegetation treatment to stormwater runoff. A variety of pollutants are present in stormwater sediments, which can be removed by physical processes such as sedimentation and filtration, provided by a bioretention system. Dissolved pollutant removal in traditional bioretention system occurs through a combination of processes such as adsorption, precipitation, ion exchange, and biological processes (Davis et al., 2009).

Removal of sediments in stormwater is generally high by bioretention system (54 to 99%) aided by filtration and sedimentation (Hatt et al., 2009). The top mulch layer in bioretention system has been shown to filter most of the TSS in the runoff (Hsieh and Davis, 2005).

Phosphorus removal rate by bioretention system has been reported to be in the range of 52 to 99% aided by filtration, sorption and plant uptake (Hunt et al., 2012). However, it is more difficult to remove dissolved phosphorus by traditional bioretention systems.

Nitrogen removal rate by bioretention system has been found to be in the range of 30 to 99% achieved by microbial metabolism, plant uptake and denitrification (Davis et al., 2009). However, aerobic bioretention conditions, which are common in flow-through media in bioretention can add nitrate-nitrogen rather than remove it. An anoxic condition is needed to convert nitrate to nitrogen gas. This can be achieved by adding an upturned elbow, anoxic zone, or internal water storage zone in bioretention systems.

Metal removal rate by bioretention system has been reported to be 54 to 99% aided by sorption, filtration, plant uptake, hydrolysis and precipitation (Passeport and Hunt, 2009). Most metal removal in bioretention system occurs in the top 5 to 20 cm of media and mulch (Davis et al., 2009).

3. Filterra® System Components

The Filterra® system is a high filtration rate stormwater treatment device that uses proprietary bioretention filtration media topped with mulch in combination with a planted tree species (Figure 1) (Anderson and Smolek, 2015). Stormwater runoff enters the system through a wide open-throated kerb inlet. Similar to conventional bioretention system, an underdrain surrounded by washed aggregate drains treated stormwater to the existing drainage infrastructure.



Figure 1. A typical Filterra site with overflow bypass pipe (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

4. Review of Field Testing on Filterra® Bioretention System

A Filterra® Bioretention System was monitored by North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA as detailed in Anderson and Smolek (2015) during 2013-14 (for 22 months). An existing parking lot of an AmtrakTM train station was retrofitted with a 6-foot by 4-foot (i.e. $1.2 \text{ m} \times 1.8 \text{ m}$ approximately) Filterra® system, which treated 0.25 acres (about 1000 m²) of impervious asphalt and concrete catchment (Figure 2). The Filterra® system area was approximately 0.22% of the catchment area. The maximum impervious drainage area for the 6-foot by 4-foot system installed in Fayetteville is 0.21 acres according to the Filterra® sizing chart for the region (for 1 inch design storm) (equivalent to 0.26% of the catchment area). Hence, the Filterra® system in the North Carolina State University testing was slightly undersized. The system was installed in September, 2012 and activated on 2nd October 2012 by Contech Engineered Solutions and performance data were obtained for 22 months during 2013-14. The site area on average receives 1049 mm of rainfall per year. The Filterra® system is shown in Figure 3.

Filterra® sizing utilizes a conservative design flow rate of about 3.5 m per hour. To design the Filterra® to treat the necessary (e.g. 25 to 40 mm) water quality volume, sizing chart for Filterra® is available, which was utilized to estimate maximum size drainage area for a Filterra® unit using a "worst case" 100% impervious drainage area.

Automatic water quality samplers were installed to collect influent and effluent samples. All rainfall at the site was measured using a tipping-bucket rain gauge. To obtain flow-weighted composite samples for each storm event, runoff was routed to the influent sampling location into a sharp-crested compound weir flow-measuring device. The sampling procedure generally meets the international standards (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

The collected water quality samples were tested for event mean concentrations of total suspended solids (TSS), suspended sediment concentration (SSC), total ammoniacal nitrogen (TAN), nitrate/nitrite-nitrogen (NO_{2,3}-N), total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), total phosphorus (TP), total dissolved phosphorus (TDP), soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP), total copper (Cu), dissolved copper, total zinc (Zn), and dissolved zinc (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).



Figure 2. Location of Filterra® at city-owned AmtrakTM parking lot in Fayetteville, North Carolina (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).



Figure 3. Filterra® at city-owned AmtrakTM parking lot in Fayetteville (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

Study results show that the Filterra® system reduced median peak flow by 56% for storms monitored in the study (0.10 to nearly 5 inches, equivalent to 2.54-127 mm, in depth) during the study period (2013-2014). About 72% of inflow volume was treated by the Filterra®, while the remainder was either bypass flow (22%) or a combination of soil storage and/or instrument error (6%). Filterra® was found to behave similarly to widely-used and approved BMPs in North Carolina (Anderson and Smolek, 2015). As reported by HEC (2009), substantial water losses were observed in the Filterra test systems at the Port of Tacoma between the influent and effluent monitoring stations during the start of the monitoring year in May and June 2008. This water loss ranged from 1.2 to 57 percent, with a median value of 27 percent. As reported in HEC (2009), a study performed by Filterra and Randolph-Macon College showed that volume storage capacity of the Filterra system increased as a function of system size and drying period, and would be ideal for capturing small, low intensity events and dry weather flows. Standard Filterra systems retained between 17.5 and 28.9 percent of the influent water volume based on a 0.1-inch rainfall intensity, which is the 80th percentile of the rainfall intensities measured in the Mid-Atlantic region of USA. Based on these results, the volume reduction in the Filterra® system may be taken as 6% as found in the North Carolina State University testing (given Filterra® system was undersized at 0.22% of the catchment area, if the system was sized at 0.3% of the catchment area, the water loss would have been higher).
Over a 22-month monitoring period, the Filterra® significantly reduced TSS concentrations with an efficiency ratio of 96%, a cumulative load reduction of 76%, and a median storm-bystorm TSS load reduction of 80%. Another sediment metric, Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC), was also measured, resulting in a 97% significant efficiency ratio, a 77% cumulative load reduction, and a 77% median storm-by-storm load reduction. The 95% confidence interval of the mean TSS removal on a per storm event basis was estimated to be 90% - 94%.

Total phosphorus concentrations were notably reduced with an efficiency ratio of 64%, a cumulative load reduction of 54% and a 63% median storm-by-storm load reduction. Overall cumulative percent loading reduction was 54%, indicating excellent removal of phosphorus for bioretention without internal water storage. Concentrations of both total dissolved phosphorus (TDP) and soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) were very low both entering and leaving the system (below what is expected on an urban watershed).

Total nitrogen concentrations were significantly reduced with an efficiency ratio of 39%, a cumulative load reduction of 39% and a 45% median storm-by-storm load reduction. Although total nitrogen was reduced, likely due to filtration of particulate-bound N, nitrate export was witnessed. This finding was expected, and is typical in systems that do not have apparent mechanisms for denitrification.

Total zinc concentrations were also significantly reduced with an efficiency ratio of 69%. For the Filterra® system as a whole, cumulative percent load reductions for TSS, TP and TN were 76%, 54% and 39%, respectively. When only storms that did not produce bypass were considered, the cumulative percent load reduction increased to 96%, 75%, and 45% for TSS, TP and TN, respectively (Anderson and Smolek, 2015).

5. Field Testing on Filterra® Bioretention System in Fayetteville, North Carolina vs. Australian data

Birch et al. (2005) assessed the efficiency of stormwater infiltration basin to remove contaminants from urban stormwater runoff in eastern Sydney. They monitored seven rainfall events. The TSS removal efficiency of the stormwater infiltration basin was about 50% on average, whereas the removal efficiencies of Cu, Pb and Zn were on average 68%, 93% and 52%, respectively. The mean removal efficiencies for total phosphorus (TP) and total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) were found to be 51% and 65%, respectively.

Hatt et al. (2007) conducted a laboratory-scale gravel infiltration system in Monash University, Clayton, Victoria to test the pollutant removal under a range of water level regimes, including both constant and variable water levels. Gravel filters were found to be very effective for removal of sediment and heavy metals under all water level regimes, even as the system clogged over time. Despite the sediment particle size distribution being much smaller than the filter media pore size, sediment and its associated pollutants were effectively trapped in the top of the gravel filter, even when the water level was allowed to vary. A media depth of 0.5m was found to achieve adequate pollutant removal. The removal efficiencies for TSS, TP, TN and zinc were 92%, 53%, 44% and 38%.

Bratieres et al. (2008) conducted a large-scale column study in purpose built greenhouse in Melbourne to test the performance of biofilters for the removal of sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus from stormwater runoff. A variety of factors were tested, using 125 large columns including plant species, filter media, filter depth, filter area and pollutant inflow concentration. The results demonstrate that vegetation selection is critical to performance for nitrogen removal (e.g. Carex appressa and Melaleuca ericifolia performed significantly better than other tested species). Whilst phosphorus removal was consistently very high (typically around 85%), biofilter soil media with added organic matter reduced the phosphorus treatment effectiveness. Biofilters built according to observed 'optimal specifications' can reliably remove both nutrients (up to 70% for nitrogen and 85% for phosphorus) and suspended solids (consistently over 95%). The optimally designed biofilter is at least 2% of its catchment area and possesses a sandy loam filter media, planted with C. appressa or M. ericifolia.

Hatt et al. (2009) investigated the hydrologic and pollutant removal performance of three field-scale biofiltration systems in Australia (one at Monash University, Clayton, Victoria and the other at McDowall, Queensland). They found that Biofilters effectively attenuated peak runoff flow rates by at least 80%. Performance assessment of a lined biofilter demonstrated that retention of inflow volumes by the filter media, for subsequent loss via evapotranspiration, reduced runoff volumes by 33% on average. Retention of water was found to be most influenced by inflow volumes, although only small to medium storms could be assessed. Vegetation was shown to be important for maintaining hydraulic capacity, because root growth and senescence countered compaction and clogging. Suspended solids and heavy metals were effectively removed, irrespective of the design configuration, with load reductions generally in excess of 90%. In contrast, nutrient retention was variable, and ranged from consistent leaching to effective and reliable removal, depending on the design. It was recommended that to ensure effective removal of phosphorus, a filter medium with low phosphorus content needs to be selected. They noted that nitrogen was more difficult to remove because it is highly soluble and strongly influenced by the variable wetting and drying regime that is inherent in biofilter operation.

Table 1 compares the pollutant removal efficiencies of Filterra® Bioretention System tested in Fayetteville, North Carolina with four Australian studies. It can be seen that TSS removal efficiency of Filterra® is 96%, which matches very well with the studies by Hatt et al. (2007) (92%), Bratieres et al. (2008) (95%) and Hatt et al. (2009) (90%).

It can be seen that TP removal efficiency of Filterra® is 64%, which is higher than the value found by Hatt et al. (2007) (53%), but smaller than the value found by Bratieres et al. (2008) (85%). It should be noted that study by Bratieres et al. (2008) was greenhouse experiment but Fayetteville, North Carolina study with Filterra® was a field study.

Pollutant	Filterra® (field tested in North Carolina, USA) (Anderson and Smolek, 2015)	Other bioretention/ infiltration systems tested in Australia	Reference
TSS	96%	50%	Birch et al. (2005): field study site in eastern Sydney
		92%	Hatt et al. (2007): laboratory experiment at Monash University Clayton, Victoria
		95%	Bratieres et al. (2008): Greenhouse experiment, Melbourne, Victoria
		90%	Hatt et al. (2009): Monash University, Clayton, Victoria and McDowall, Queensland
TP	64%	51%	Birch et al. (2005): field study site in eastern Sydney
		53%	Hatt et al. (2007): laboratory experiment at Monash University Clayton, Victoria
		85%	Bratieres et al. (2008): Greenhouse experiment, Melbourne, Victoria
		Not available	Hatt et al. (2009): Monash University, Clayton, Victoria and McDowall, Queensland
TN	39%	65% (TKN)	Birch et al. (2005): field study site in eastern Sydney
		44%	Hatt et al. (2007): laboratory experiment at Monash University Clayton, Victoria
		Up to 70%	Bratieres et al. (2008): Greenhouse experiment, Melbourne, Victoria
		Not available	Hatt et al. (2009): Monash University, Clayton, Victoria and McDowall, Queensland
Zn	69%	52%	Birch et al. (2005): field study site in eastern Sydney
		38%	Hatt et al. (2007): laboratory experiment at Monash University Clayton, Victoria
		Not available	Bratieres et al. (2008): Greenhouse experiment, Melbourne, Victoria
		Not available	Hatt et al. (2009): Monash University, Clayton, Victoria and McDowall, Queensland

Table 1. Comparison of Filterra® Bioretention System tested in Fayetteville, North Carolina vs. Australian data

There are little published data on contaminants in runoff from carparks in Australia. The contaminant concentrations and load in the carpark runoff depend on factors such as traffic volume in the carpark, surrounding land use, adopted maintenance mode and frequency. The small catchment size of carpark is likely to show a first flush effect after the heavy rainfall events. Hence, comparison of contaminants in the carpark runoff from different studies located in different regions must be interpreted in light of the local conditions.

Fletcher et al. (2004) recommended the event mean concentrations (EMC) for a number of land uses in Australia, which are widely used in design (Table 2). It is found that contaminant concentrations for the case of Mitchell Community College carpark testing are much smaller than reported by Fletcher et al. (2004).

Table 2.	EMC fo	or dif	ferent	land	uses	in A	Austr	alia (l	Fletc	her e	et al.,	2004)	con	npared	with
Mitchell	Commu	nity	College	e car	park	testi	ing (values	in	parei	ntheses	s indic	ate	Fayette	eville
Filterra®	Bioreter	ntion	result)												

Contaminant	Range (mg/L)	Typical value (mg/L)
Suspended solids	900 - 800	270
	(20 - 730)	(120)
Total Nitrogen	1.00 - 5.00	2.2
	(0.35 - 2.62)	(1.20)
Total Phosphorus	0.15 - 1.5	0.5
	(0.03 - 0.59)	(0.130)

In another study by Morison (2001) for St Martins Shopping Village carpark in Western Sydney using a rainfall simulator (calibrated for a 1 in six month storm of 15 minutes duration) showed a first flush effect for 10 minutes with an approximate EMC for a duration of 15 minutes of Suspended Solids (95 mg/L), Total Nitrogen (1.85 mg/L) and Total Phosphorus (0.15 mg/L). The results from Morison (2001) and Fletcher et al. (2004) when compared with Mitchell Community College carpark testing exhibit a large difference, which perhaps are due to different land use characteristics and traffic volume representing local conditions.

It should be highlighted that if the EMC in the influent is higher, the contaminant removal efficiency by a stormwater quality improvement device should be higher. Hence, it is highly likely that the efficiency ratio for Fayetteville Filterra® Bioretention system would be much higher if the influent EMCs were higher as reported in Australia.

6. Conclusion

Based on this literature review, the following conclusions can be made:

• The sampling and monitoring protocol of field testing of Filterra® Bioretention System by North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA as detailed in Anderson and Smolek (2015) generally follows the international and Australian standards of field testing. Hence, the test results from this study are deemed to be reliable.

- In the North Carolina State University testing, a 6-foot by 4-foot Filterra® was adopted for 0.25 acres of impervious asphalt and concrete catchment area, i.e. the Filterra® system area was approximately 0.22% of the catchment area. According to the local Filterra® sizing guideline, the treatment area should have been 0.21 acres (i.e. Filterra® system area should have been 0.26% of the catchment area). Based on these data, the minimum sizing criterion of Filterra® for Australia may be taken as 0.3% of catchment area.
- Results from North Carolina State University testing show that the 1.2 m×1.8m Filterra® system reduced median peak flow by 56% for storms (2.54-127 mm in depth) monitored during the study period for treatable catchment area of about 1000 m². About 72% of inflow volume was treated by the Filterra®. The mean annual rainfall in the study area is 1049 mm. Depending on the local rainfall and given catchment area in Australia, the appropriate size of the Filterra® system needs to be calculated.
- Based on the results of the North Carolina State University testing and other similar studies, the volume reduction in the Filterra® system (due to factors such as storage and evapotranspiration) may be taken as 6% of rainfall volume (generally applicable for smaller rainfall events e.g. 3 mm or less), which is ideal for capturing small, low intensity rainfall events and dry weather flows.
- The pollution removal efficiencies of Filterra® Bioretention System in the North Carolina State University testing has been found to be about 96%, 64%, 39% and 69% for TSS, TP, TN and Zn. When only storms that did not produce bypass were considered, the cumulative percent load reduction increased to 96%, 75%, and 45% for TSS, TP and TN, respectively (Anderson and Smolek, 2015). These pollution removal efficiencies for Filterra® Bioretention System are likely to vary from site to site depending on the surrounding urban land use condition and rainfall characteristics; and these values are shown to match quite well with similar Australian studies with the bioretension systems. Hence, it is highly likely that Filterra® Bioretention System will achieve hydrologic and pollutant removal performances in typical Australian urban catchments (as required by the local councils) at least at the same level found by the North Carolina State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA field testing as detailed in Anderson and Smolek (2015).
- Based on this review, for typical stormwater modelling (e.g. using MUSIC) in Australia using Filterra® Bioretention system, the following pollution removal efficiencies may be adopted: 96% (for TSS), 64% (for TP) and 39% (for TN) together with a volume reduction of 6%. It should be noted that the removal efficiencies recommended are less than the cumulative percent load reduction for storms (without bypass).
- It should be noted that TN removal efficiency is subject to greater uncertainty as bioretention systems do not have adequate mechanisms for denitrification. It is suggested that field testing of Filterra® Bioretention System should be conducted in typical Australian urban catchments of the discrete nutrient speciation (for N) removals to confirm above findings of this review.

7. References

Anderson, A., and Smolek, A. (2015). Filterra® Bioretention System Water Quality and Hydrologic Field-Scale Performance Evaluation, Research Report, North Carolina State University Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, D.S. Weaver Labs, Raleigh, NC, USA, 126 pp.

Birch, G.F., Fazeli, M.S. and Matthai, C. (2005). Efficiency of an infiltration basin in removing contaminants from urban stormwater, Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 101, 23-38.

Bratieres, K., Fletcher, T.D., Deletic, A. and Zinger, Y. (2008). Nutrient and sediment removal by stormwater biofilters: a large-scale design optimisation study. Water Research, 42, 3930–3940.

Davis, A.P. (2005). Green engineering principles promote low impact development. Environmental Science & Technology 39 (16), 338A–344A.

Davis, A.P., Hunt, W.F., Traver, R.G. and Clar, M. (2009). Bioretention technology: overview of current practice and future needs. Journal of Environmental Engineering 135, 109–117.

Fletcher, T., Duncan, H., Poelsma, P. and Lloyd, S. (2004). Stormwater Flow and Quality and the Effectiveness of Non-Proprietary Stormwater Treatment Measure – A Review and Gap Analysis, Technical Report 04/8. Cooperative Research Centre for Catchment Hydrology, Monash University, Australia.

Hatt, B.E., Deletic, A., and Fletcher, T.D. (2007). Stormwater reuse: designing biofiltration systems for reliable treatment. Water Science and Technology 55 (4), 201–209.

Hatt, B.E., Fletcher, T.D. and Deletic, A. (2008). Hydraulic and pollutant removal performance of fine media stormwater filtration systems. Environmental Science and Technology 42, 2535–2541.

Hatt, B.E., Fletcher and T. D., Deletic, A. (2009). Hydrologic and pollutant removal performance of stormwater biofiltration systems at the field scale, Journal of Hydrology, 365, 310-321.

Herrera Environmental Consultants (HEC) (2009). Filterra Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Seattle, Washington, USA.

Hsieh, C.H., and Davis, A.P. (2005). Evaluation and optimization of bioretention media for treatment of urban stormwater runoff. J. Environ. Eng., 1521-1531.

Hunt, W.F., Davis, A.P., and Traver, R.G. (2012). Meeting hydrologic and water quality goals through targeted bioretention design. J. Environ. Eng., 698-707.

Lucas, W.C., and Greenway, M. (2008). Nutrient retention in vegetated and nonvegetated bioretention mesocosms. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 134, 613–623.

Morison, P. (2001). Rainfall Simulation Experiment at St Martins Shopping Village, NSW.https://www.google.com.au/search?sourceid=navclient&aq=&oq=constituents+in+ca+

park+runoff&ie=UTF8&rlz=1T4TSAU_enAU383AU383&q=peter+morison+mt+druitt+car +park&gs_l=hp..3.41118.0.0.4.186958.....0.CxJawMDyNU8.

Passeport, E. and Hunt ,W.F. (2009). Asphalt parking lot runoff nutrient characterization for eight sites in North Carolina, USA. J. Hydrol. Eng., 14:4(352), 352-361.

Roy-Poirier, A., Champagne, P. and Filion, Y. (2010). Review of bioretention system research and design: past, present and future, Journal of Environmental Engineering, 136(9), 878-889.

Wong, T.H.F. (Editor) (2006). Australian Runoff Quality: A Guide to Water Sensitive Urban Design. Engineers Australia, Sydney.

Appendix E Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Ralf Pfleiderer

This appendix provides the peer review of Filterra® biofiltration systems undertaken by Ralf Pfleiderer from RPEC for Ocean Protect.

RPEC Ralf Pfleiderer Environmental Consulting

Stormwater – Urban Cooling – Green Infrastructure 100 Allisons Road, Blampied, VIC 3364 | Ph: 0488 659 446 | ABN: 12 107 308 911 consulting@ralfpfleiderer.com.au www.ralfpfleiderer.com.au

Tuesday, 5 May 2020

Peer review – Filterra Biofiltration system

This peer review is for Ocean Protect's Filterra biofiltration system and its suitability to conditions in Victoria, Australia.

The review is based on a site inspection of the in ground systems at Western Sydney University and Warwick Farm in Sydney on 17 March 2020 (via video conference due to the Convid-19 restrictions), documentation and field monitoring data provided by Ocean Protect.

I am basing this review on the information supplied and applying my knowledge of Victorian biofiltration/raingarden systems. I have 20 years of experience in designing, building and maintaining these systems as a consultant, working in local government (City of Melbourne) and through hands-on experience at Wave Maintenance and Australia Ecosystems.

In my opinion, Filterra biofiltration systems should perform adequately in Victoria, meeting the required best practice standards. It should be pointed out that the Filterra biofiltration system is installed and maintained by the Ocean Protect's in house team or by approved installers. Therefore, they stand behind their product. The capital and operational cost per square metre is higher than the average raingarden installation, but, given the lower footprint due to its higher flow throughput, it can have a lower life cycle cost. Its treatment performance has been proven through several field monitoring studies to meet or exceed the required standards for TSS (80-96%) and TP (54-69%) when sized at 0.3% of the catchment. Results from studies to date shows it falls just short for TN at 35-40% removal. The target 45% TN removal can be achieved by a slight increase in the sizing of the system or utilising vegetation recognised (e.g. in FAWB guidelines) as providing effective nutrient removal". At Western Sydney, a Lilly Pilly is used, which is not recognised as being an effective nutrient removing plant. Higher nutrient removals would be expected if effective nutrient removal vegetation were used.

As the industry is aware, there are many raingardens and biofiltration systems out there that are not meeting their design intentions. This is sometimes due to bad design or construction not complying to the design, particularly regarding levels and the installed filter soil. But they mostly fail due to lack of maintenance, particularly sediment removal. As Ocean Protect is willing to stand behind Filterra biofiltration systems and undertake the required maintenance, I think the Filterra biofiltration systems are likely to overcome many of the difficulties commonly experienced by typical biofiltration systems. Being a vegetation-based system, it also provides greening and biodiversity outcomes, unlike other proprietary cartridge filters on the market.

Kind Regards,

Ralf Pfleiderer Principal Ralf Pfleiderer Environmental Consulting

Industry experience

I have an Environmental Engineer qualification and am well-recognised within Melbourne's Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) and Integrated Water Management (IWM) industry: with twenty years' experience in both private and public enterprise. In all my work, I have applied my engineering skills within a landscape, green infrastructure and open space context

Over my twenty-year career I have:

- Delivered many iconic wetland and stormwater harvesting projects through my work with the City of Melbourne and Australian Ecosystems including: <u>Trin Warren Tam-boore</u> wetland at Royal Park, stormwater harvesting schemes at <u>Fitzroy Gardens</u>, <u>Darling Street</u>, <u>Birrarung Marr</u>, <u>Alexander</u>, <u>Queen Victoria Garden</u>, <u>Lincoln Square</u> and levers Reserve and many housing development treatment wetlands, including <u>Waterways</u>, <u>Mernda Villages</u>, <u>Caroline Springs</u>, Cairnlea and the Eynesbury Estate.
- Been involved in the delivery of streetscape projects including: Retrofitting stratavault infiltration pits to existing mature trees at Atherton Rd Oakleigh, Passive irrigation soak wells for Moonee Valley City Council and raingarden installations for the City of Melbourne at Docklands, Howards St and Hardiman St as well as many tree pit raingardens.
- Coordinated the design and installation, monitoring and review of the permeable pavement infiltration trenches at Eades PI, Harris St, Abbotsford St and Collins St.
- Undertaken formal audits of WSUD infrastructure for the following councils; Melton, Melbourne, Monash and Stonnington. Informal review of systems in Darebin, Kingston, Port Phillip, Moreland, Casey and Mannington.
- Provided raingarden rectification designs for Monash and Stonnington councils.
- Undertaken raingarden and tree pit maintenance for City of Stonnington.
- Provided Stormwater harvesting system maintenance and rectification for Banyule city council.
- Managed and/or undertaken wetland planting and maintenance on 100+ constructed wetlands across Melbourne and Victoria during the 10 years at Australian Ecosystems

I have also served seven years on the Stormwater Victoria (SV) committee, three years as president (2013-2016). Being actively involved with SV has greatly extended my network and knowledge of the industry. During my time at City of Melbourne I also looked to connect with council officers in similar roles to share and exchange knowledge, allowing us to share and overcome issues quicker. Given this is a very new and evolving industry, there are many issues that need resolving as well as many new ideas and innovations to consider. A healthy network of peers makes this easier.

In 2012 I participated in the <u>Water Sensitive Cities Study tour</u>. Together with eighteen other water industry professionals from around Australia, we visited IWM projects across Australia and in Singapore, the UK, Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands. This has further developed our understanding of how to apply to IWM in other contexts. It also developed our networks beyond our local contacts.

All this has exposed me to biofiltration approaches and problems in many different contexts and provided me with a good understanding of issues to avoid.

Biofiltration / Raingarden issues

Over my time in the WSUD/IWM industry I have seen many hundreds of raingardens, many variations of raingarden designs as they have evolved and I have found plenty of evidence showing their failed construction or supervision with specification not adhered to. I have additionally made return visits to see how they preform over time and how, with lack of maintenance, these system deteriorate quickly to not serving as a water quality improvement asset at the very least, and at worst, being an eye sore and public safety risk.

Key failure modes of biofiltration/raingarden systems include:

- Sediment and leaf litter blocking inlets, excluding water from entering.
- Sediment or clay clogging the filter media surface.
- Leaf litter and sediment accumulating and building up in the EDD area with plant roots establishing within this zone.
- Outlet structures built too low, not allowing for extended detention.
- Inlets too narrow hence blocking easily with leaf litter and/or sediment.
- Incorrect filter media installed.

A flow on problem from sediment accumulating on top of the filter media, which it will, especially if there is no sediment trap at the inlet or this trap is not cleaned regularly, is when rock mulch is used (a common practice in Melbourne). The sediment accumulates in the void amongst the rock and generally, to remove the sediment, the rock mulch is removed and replaced as well. This double or triples the volume needing to be disposed of and therefore the cost as well. It is also a wasted resource.

Some of the issues listed above are sometimes caused by bad design. Many can be traced back to construction compromises or not following the intended design. But most are resolved by regular maintenance by crews with specific WSUD knowledge and the functionality of the raingarden in mind.

Filterra biofiltration systems

The design and implementation of Filterra[®] biofiltration systems has been developed by Contech Engineered Solutions based on more than twenty years of research and development, testing and field monitoring (Contech 2016). Contech Engineered Solutions have been operating in North America for 35 years. They provide cost-effective engineered site solutions for contractors, engineers, architects, and owners. Their portfolio includes bridges, drainage, erosion control, retaining wall, sanitary sewer, and stormwater management products.

Filterra biofiltration systems is similar to typical biofiltration systems in its function and application but has been optimized for high volume/flow treatment and high pollutant removal. The high treatment volumes allow for a significantly lower footprint, down to 0.3% of the catchment area, while still achieving best practice pollution reduction targets. Typical biofiltration systems are sized at 0.8 to 1.5% of the catchment area. It is also produced under strict quality control procedures, unlike the filter media samples provides by soil suppliers.

The Filterra biofiltration system also utilises some additional innovations:

- Double shredded hardwood mulch is used on top of the Filterra media. This mulch layer effectively captures the sediment entering the system before it gets to the filter media. The mulch is removed and replaced annually to prevent clogging. Being organically based, it can be composted or recycled.
- By using the organic mulch there is no issue with using a wide-open inlet and allowing all sediment and litter to enter. The annual clean out effectively restores the cleaning capacity of the system (more regular cleaning for leaf and litter can be undertaken for aesthetic reasons or to unblock the inlet during times of high litter loads such as Autumn).
- Ocean Protect install and maintain their systems for a minimum of one year (and ideally longer) therefore ensuring quality control and standing behind their systems effectiveness. They also offer a design service.

Monitoring results

The Filterra biofiltration system was developed in the USA through many years of research, monitoring and development by Contech, based on studies from the University of Virginia. More than 8500 systems have been installed across nine states in the USA. The Filterra systems monitoring results have also recently been published by North Carolina State University and Bellinghams in Washington.

Locally, Ocean Protect is undertaking monitoring of a field site at Western Sydney University. This is a small tree pit system in the university car park. Ocean Protect have installed a high-tech remote auto sampling monitoring station within a container next to the tree pit. Measuring in and outflow as well as nutrients in and out, this data is being assessed against the SQUID protocol and more stringent City of Gold Coast's *Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices* (2015). These results have been provided and reviewed. A summary of the results is provided in *A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia April 2020.*

	TSS	TP	TN
All qualifying data	Median CRE 80.0%	Median CRE 70.6%	Median CRE 35.0%
	ER 77.3%	ER 78%	ER 38.1%
SQIDEP –	Median CRE 80.8%	Median CRE 84.6%	Median CRE 54.6%
Selecting 15 best results for TN	ER 79.7%	ER 81.1%	ER 53.7%

The WSU field monitoring has been running for over 18 months and has the following results.

The WSU car park site is small and has low nutrient inputs. This makes nutrient reduction a challenge for any system. The higher the input the easier it is to strip nutrients and therefore better performance. That the TN reduction is not 45% is not surprising given the mean influent of 1.679mg/L and that the system does not have a denitrification process.

I do not pretend to be an expert on the process of field monitoring and result analysis. Ocean Protect have been open with sharing the monitoring results, providing chain of custody documents and running through the monitoring process and equipment. Other experts including Associate Professor Ataur Rahman from the Civil Engineering Department at the Western Sydney University have reviewed the data thoroughly. His peer review is provided as an attachment to *A review of the application of Filterra*® *Biofiltration Systems in Australia April 2020.*

Conclusion

The Filterra biofiltration system is a novel new approach to biofiltration of stormwater on the Australian market. With its high flow filter media (>3500mm/hr) it takes a vastly different approach to the usual loamy sand filter media system with a recommended hydraulic conductivity of 180-300mm/hr.

The evidence provided by Ocean Protect through its trial sites in Sydney look promising. The monitoring data shows good results, despite the catchment being very low in inflow nutrients. Monitoring undertaken to date for Filterra biofiltration systems complies with Stormwater Australia's SQIDEP (Version 1.3) and City of Gold Coast's "Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices" (DesignFlow 2015)

Appropriately designed, installed, established and maintained Filterra biofiltration systems would be expected to provide a suitable stormwater treatment function in Victorian (particularly Melbourne).

The treatment performance of Filterra biofiltration systems can be modelled using MUSIC's bioretention node. The treatment node properties should be adjusted according to Table 3-1 in *A review of the application of Filterra® Biofiltration Systems in Australia*". Sometimes, using this approach, MUSIC indicates that a Filterra biofiltration system with a smaller area than 0.3% of the upstream catchment may be able to achieve given stormwater quality objectives. However, it is recommended that a Filterra biofiltration size of 0.3% of upstream catchment be applied.

The Filterra biofiltration system addresses several of the systemic issues with biofiltration systems including its use of hardwood mulch as a sediment trap and moisture retention layer.

I would recommend the consideration of the Filterra biofiltration system as an option for your next biofiltration project.



- Stormwater enters the Filterra through a pipe, curb inlet, or sheet flow and ponds over the pretreatment mulch layer, capturing heavy sediment and debris. Organics and microorganisms within the mulch trap and degrade metals and hydrocarbons. The mulch also provides water retention for the system's vegetation.
- 2 Stormwater flows through engineered Filterra media which filters fine pollutants and nutrients. Organic material in the media removes dissolved metals and acts as a food source for root-zone microorganisms. Treated water exits through an underdrain pipe or infiltrates (if designed accordingly).
- Rootzone microorganisms digest and transform pollutants into forms easily absorbed by plants.
- Plant roots absorb stormwater and pollutants that were transformed by microorganisms, regenerating the media's pollutant removal capacity. The roots grow, provide a hospitable environment for the rootzone microorganisms and penetrate the media, maintaining hydraulic conductivity.
- 5 The plant trunk and foliage utilize nutrients such as Nitrogen and Phosphorus for plant health, sequester heavy metals into the biomass, and provide evapotranspiration of residual water within the system.

Appendix F Peer Review of Filterra® biofiltration systems by Damian McCann

This appendix provides the peer review of Filterra® biofiltration systems undertaken by Damian McCann from AWC for Ocean Protect.



Brad Dalrymple Ocean Protect 29 Chetwynd Street Loganholme QLD 4129

20th May 2020 AWC Reference: 1-201228_Filterra_SQIDEP_Review_Phase2

Dear Brad

RE: Filterra SQIDEP Review

Australian Wetlands Consulting (AWC) was commissioned to audit the

performance monitoring of the Filterra Biofiltration System in Australia and confirm compliance with two documents:

- Stormwater Australia's *SQIDEP (Version 1.3)*
- City of Gold Coast's "*Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices*" (August, 2015)

Ocean Protect supplied the following materials pertaining to the performance monitoring:

- A review of the application of Filterra Biofiltration Systems in Australia (Ocean Protect, April 2020) that contained in Appendix B Stormwater treatment performance for a high flow rate biofiltration system at Western Sydney, Kingswood, NSW as an Appendix (B)
- A Microsoft excel file *Filterra WSU biofiltration system SQIDEP Compliance 200420* containing data and statistical analysis from the monitoring undertaken at Western Sydney
- Laboratory Chain of Custody (COC) documentation and Certificates of Analysis from samples collected during the monitoring undertaken at Western Sydney
- Individual storm reports containing time, date and duration of the storm event; rainfall and flow data; number of aliquots; and a hydrograph from the monitoring undertaken at Western Sydney
- Statutory Declaration confirming the system has been maintained in accordance with typical/standard maintenance procedures
- Particle size distribution results for two storm events

Water | Ecology | Management

8 George St Bangalow NSW 2479

p. (02) 6687 1550

- e. info@awconsult.com.au
- w. awconsult.com.au



Australian Wetlands Consulting Pty Ltd ABN 81 140 533 919



Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a site inspection of the monitoring site at the Western Sydney University Campus, Kingswood, was conducted remotely on 23rd March 2020.

Based on a review of the information provided and the remote site inspection, AWC confirm that the field testing of the Filterra Biofiltration System conducted at the Western Sydney site complies with the requirements of SQIDEP (v1.3) Field Evaluation pathway and the City of Gold Coast's "Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices", as

shown in the attached Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

The following key information needs to be highlighted with regards to any Treatment Claims that can be made with regards to the Filterra system evaluated under the SQIDEP framework:

- The system evaluated has an external high-flow bypass mechanism (bypass occurs prior to the treatment element of the device). The outlet flow was sampled prior to mixing with any bypassed flows. Thus, no pollutant removal can be claimed for bypassed flow (bypassed flow must be assumed to have zero removal under the protocol);
- The tested device had a design Treatable Flow Rate of 1.42 L/s (assuming a saturated hydraulic conductivity of the Filterra biofiltration system of 3550 mm/hour). Hydraulic monitoring confirmed the device treated flows up to at least 2.024L/s which was the limit of the monitoring equipment used;
- The tested device had a total area of 1.45 m², equating to 0.35% of the catchment area;
- The Pollutant Concentration Reduction Claims that can be made as a result of the described field evaluation are as follows (we note that volumetric losses are anticipated across biofiltration systems, including Filterra, and these were not assessed as part of this review):

Analyte	Median	Average	Efficiency
	CRE (%)	CRE (%)	Ratio (%)
TSS	80	75	77
DP	0	0	35
TP	71	67	78
TN	35	37	38

Furthermore, AWC have been asked to consider the applicability of the results from this trial to other regions, including Melbourne, Brisbane, Moreton Bay Regional Council, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Toowoomba, Noosa, Townsville and Mackay. It is our opinion that Filterra biofiltration systems designed, installed, established and maintained in line with the trial system and design treatable flow rates evaluated here (1.42L/s), are likely to provide stormwater treatment performance at these other



locations similar with that observed at the trial site. This is probably a conservative treatable flow rate given our observation of up to 2.024L/s being treated during the trial.

Despite MUSIC modelling suggesting a sizing of around 0.1% of catchment is appropriate, we agree with the Ocean Protect's recommendation to conservatively size the Filterra system at 0.3% of contributing catchment, in accordance with Table 3-1 of the report "*A review of the application of Filterra Biofiltration Systems in Australia (Ocean Protect, April 2020)*".

I hope this summary is clear but please contact me with any questions.

Your sincerely,

Aller

Damian McCann Director



Attachment 1

Table 1 Assessment of the Filterra Biofiltration System performance monitoring undertaken at Western Sydney against SQIDEP (v1.3) requirements (the respective page number where the requirement is discussed in SQIDEP v1.3 is shown for ease of reference).

SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	ance	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC comments
		mpli		1
		ပိ		compliance
Catchment area (p14)	420m ²	Y		
Land Use (p14)	Car Park	Y		
Percentage Impervious	100%	Y		
cover (p14)				
Aerial photos (p14)	Figure B-1	Y		
Site Photos (p14)	Figures B-2 and B-3	Y		
Potential pollutant	Not stated		Vehicles, leaves, grass, human litter.	Y
sources (p14)				
Site map showing: [p14]	Figure B-1 shows the		Catchment was defined by land survey	Y
Catchment area	carpark and the catchment		and site inspections. Now described	
Drainage system	area within the carpark,		in report.	
Treatment device	the catchment area was			
Sampling points	defined			
	defined			
Treatable flow rate (TFR)	Not stated		1.42L/s. Now provided in report.	Y
(p14)				
			Equal to the design flow rate	
			multiplied by the filter area	
			(3.560m/hr x 1.44m²)	
Rainfall ≤ 5 min time	Timing interval not		1 minute. Detail now provided in	Υ.
interval (p15)	specified in the report		report. Individual flow files can be	
			provided upon request.	
Rainfall ≤ 0.25mm	0.25mm	Y	0.25mm tip	Y
Increments (p15)	A		Commente an the combain on Datail and	N N
Rainfall - Location snown	Assuming it was placed on		Correct, on the container. Detail now	Y
Painfall Chacked	Net stated in report		2 Courses used Eastery colibrated	V
cleared of debris and	Not stated in report		Checked for Debris Detail now	T
calibrated at least two			provided in report	
times during the testing				
period (p15)				
Rainfall - Protected from	Not stated in report		Bolted to roof of container and is	Y
excessive wind velocities			stable. The tipping bucket itself is	
(p15)			designed to be shielded from the	
			wind. Detail now provided in report.	
Min 15 events (p15-16)	16 storms events were	Y	Results for all 23 qualifying storms at	Y
	used		Western Sydney are provided.	



SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	e	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC
		and		comments
		ildr		1
		Con		compliance
			The sensitivity analyses undertaken	
			(see Table 3 - WSU Data, in provided	
			spreadsheet) shows how TN CRE	
			would increase from 37 to 52% if we	
			'cherry picked' our best 15 events (as	
			allowed under SQIDEP).	
Achieve at least 90%	No statistical testing was		See paired t test calculation in sheet	Υ
statistical significance	discussed in the report		Paired t test calculation provided	
between paired samples			spreadsheet	
of influent and effluent				
(p15-16)				
Each monitoring program	Table B-3 provides the	Y		
will need to identify the	date of each event and the			
period delineating the	sampling duration in nours			
beginning of the pext -				
typically 24brs or the time				
taken to reset monitoring				
equipment (p15-16)				
Hydrographs for each	No hydrographs provided		Provided Now	Y
event to demonstrate the				
program has				
representatively captured				
the event (p15-16)				
Min 2 peak inflows from	TFR of the device not		TFR now given on first page.	Y
the sampled events	stated in report			
should exceed 75% of the				
design TFR of the device				
+ 1 \ge than its design IFR				
(p10-16)	Manitaring pariod approx		Data far now (mars recent events now	V
distributed throughout	12 months (19/6/18 to		added)	T
the monitoring period to	//7/19]			
capture seasonal	··//////).			
influences on storm	16 events			
conditions				
	Number of events per			
&	season:			
	• Summer: 2			
The independent	• Autumn: 1			
evaluation panel must be	• Winter: 7			
satisfied that the	 Spring: 6 			
qualifying storms				
includes a good range of				



SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	e	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC
		and		comments
		pli		/
		Com		compliance
storm overt (lenger and	Summer and Autumn	0		
storm event (tonger and shortor duration) (p15-16)	Summer and Autumn			
	bowever drought			
	conditions existed for			
	much of 2018 and 2019 and			
	likely impacted the range			
	of storm events that were			
	able to be used			
	The representativeness of			
	the storm events is difficult			
	to assess given the lack of			
	historical rainfall data for			
	the area which is not			
	discussed nor presented in			
	the report.			
50% of qualifying storms	Section B.3.2 states that		Hydrographs have been provided to	Y
should include the first	the Project Plan generally		review.	
70% storm hydrograph	satisfied this requirement,			
coverage (p15-16)	however, no hydrographs			
	of any events were			
	provided			
Flow measurement at the	The report lacks any		Bypass occurs when total flow is	Y
inlet and outlet are	details on the bypass flow		more than the treatment flow, except	
recommended.	in the methodology or		a very small part of the catchment	
Monitoring of bypass	discussion.		contributes to the bypass without	
flows is optional,			going to the treatment.	
however, at a minimum				
the monitoring				
Information should be				
sufficient to identify				
perious when device is				
The OAPP chould identify	No commonte on this in		Sampled Prior to the inclusions of	V
whether offluent	the report		mixing with hypacs. Now stated in the	T
characterization accounts	the report		report	
for total storm flow				
including bypass if it				
occurs (p17)				
Outlet flow should be	Sampling was conducted		Sampled Prior to the inclusions of	Y
sampled either prior to or	on the bypass flow but		mixing with bypass. Now stated in the	
after mixing with bypass	there was no discussion		report.	
flow and Claims identify	about this in the report			
the inclusions/exclusion				
of bypass flows (p17)				



SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	e	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC
		anc		comments
		pli		1
		Com		compliance
Make, model and	Influent sampler: ISCO 730		The ISCO 730 Bubbler in conjunction	Y
procedures and schedule	Bubbler Weir module		with a Thel-mar weir was used for the	
for calibration, inspection	connected to an ISCO 6712		Filterra test site at WSU.	
and cleaning shall be	Portable Automated			
provided (p20)	Sampler and installed		750 Area Velocity was initially used to	
	within a pre-configured		measure total flow in the outlet pipe;	
	and calibrated 152mm		however, the data was inaccurate and	
	diameter Thel-Mar Weir		we swapped to a bubbler module for	
	for flow analysis of treated		this one as well. Which is why there is	
	effluent and sample pacing		total flow data missing for the first set	
			of storms.	
	ISCO 750 Area Velocity			
	Flow Module with a Low		The bubblers are regularly checked	
	Profile Area Velocity Flow		for calibration by submersing the weir	
	Sensor connected to an		in water and setting the depth on the	
	ISCO 6712 Portable		sampler with the bubbler module to	
	Automated Sampler for		the depth measured. The tables for	
	total flow analysis and		the flow against height are provided	
	effluent sample pacing		by The-mar and input into the	
			samplers This detail is now provide in	
			report.	
Rainfall (p20)	ISCO 674 tipping bucket,		The rain gauge is factory-calibrated	Y
	but no commentary on		and needs no further Adjustment. But	
	calibration in report		does require check for debris	
			periodically. Which we have done. We	
			have also used two rain gauges to	
			check against each other and found	
			no inconsistencies. This detail is now	
			provided in report.	
Flow proportional	Only two events had < 16		Have provided hydrographs in ISR	Υ
sampling requires at	aliquots to achieve the		PDFs. Also, see Table B-3.	
least 80% of the	80%, however, no			
submitted events have at	hydrographs have been			
least 8 aliquots collected	supplied			
from both the rising and				
falling limbs of the				
hydrograph to form the				
composite sample (p21)				
Sample blanks for field	Not discussed in the report		Provided now	Y
and analytical testing to				
be supplied (p21)				
COC documents	Not supplied		Provided now	Υ
identifying sample				
collection, collection				



SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	e	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC
		and		comments
		ilqr		1
		Com		compliance
agancy collection time				
nreservation used				
laboratory receipt of				
sample and sample				
collection shall be				
provided (p21)				
NATA accreditation (n21)	Sub-samples were		ALS is NATA-accredited WSIL isn't	Y
nana decreditation (p21)	analysed by ALS and		doing any analysis as yet (but is not a	
	Western Sydney University		NATA-accredited lab) Detail now	
	NATA accreditation not		provided in report	
	stated in the report			
Method of analysis	Analytical method stated in	Y		
detailed (p21)	Table B-2			
Non-detects (p23)	Non detects were reported		Limit of Readings are in the attached	Y
Effluent sample results	but there was no		certificate of analysis. Sensitivity	
below the limit of	discussion about the		analysis now undertaken (see	
detection (LOD) shall be	sensitivity analysis in the		spreadsheet sheet 'Table 3 - WSU	
set at 0.5 x LOD and must	report		Data')	
be accompanied by a				
sensitivity analysis				
showing impact on				
performance metrics of				
adopting both LOD and 0).				
Performance metrics	This does not appear to be		The system is offline	Y
(p25)	discussed in the report		The treatment flow is collected prior	
Analysis should clearly			to mixing with the bypass.	
indicate how treatment			The flows measured are the effluent	
and bypass flows (either			flow pipe and the downstream total	
external or internal to the			flow (effluent + bypass). This detail	
device) have been			now provided in report.	
accounted for in the				
presentation of results.				
Average and Median	It is not clear how these		There are no bypass samples taken	Y
Concentration Removal	were calculated as there is		and therefore the samples taken are	
Efficiency (p25)	no details on the bypass		only the effluent samples and require	
	set up nor is there any		not additional calculations	
	reporting of confidence			
	Interval achieved		5140	
Event Mean	The report does not		EMCs are provided in the xlsx	Y
Concentration and Mass	contain this information		spreadsheet	
Discharge (p30)				
The event mean			Box plots now provided in report.	
concentration and Mass				
Discharge variability are				



SQIDEP Requirement	Initial AWC comments	Compliance	Ocean Protect Response	Final AWC comments / compliance
required to verify the ability of the device to manage large variability in EMCs and mass discharges.				
Box and whisker plots should be prepared for influent and effluent EMCs as well as mass loads (where presented).				
The number of EMCs and mass loads contributing to each distribution should be clearly indicated.				



Attachment 2

Table 2 Assessment of the Filterra Biofiltration System performance monitoring undertaken at Western Sydney against The City of Gold Coast's "Development Application Requirements and Performance Protocol for Proprietary Devices"

Requirement	Field Evidence Criteria	AWC Assessment / Compliance	Ocean Protect Response
Location	Minimum of one Australian field test site, additional international data will be accepted	Y	
Type of Event	Rainfall events (does not include Controlled Field Tests)	Y	
Minimum Number of Events	10 events (preferably 15 events) with at least 7 events form a single location Where statistical significance is not achieved for a given parameter, then additional events will be required until the result is statistically significant	Y	
Minimum Rainfall Depth	5mm and must trigger full operating mode of the cartridge filter (e.g. engage siphon flow)	Of the 23 events, 7 recorded total rainfall < 5mm. However, all storms were included in statistical analysis	
Minimum Storm Duration	5 minutes	Y	
Minimum Inter- event Time	72 hours for minimum of 5 events; 6 hours for other events	Y	
Device Size	Full Scale	Y	
Runoff Characteristics	Target flow and pollutant profile of influent (inflow) and effluent (outflow)	Y	
Runoff Volume or Peak Flow	Runoff of at least 3 events should exceed 75% of the design water quality volume/treatment flow rate or capacity of the device and 1	Y	



Requirement	Field Evidence Criteria AWC Assessment / Compliance		Ocean Protect Response	
	event greater than the design flow.			
Automated Sampling	Composite samples on a flow weight basis	Y		
Minimum Number of Aliquots	6 per event spread over the hydrograph	Y		
Hydrograph Coverage	Indicative 50% (importantly the rising and falling hydrograph components should be included in testing, and dependent on catchment and rainfall patterns, multiple peaks should be accounted for). Individual storm event reports are to be provided to Council as part of the assessment.	Y		
Manual Sampling	Only for constituents that transform rapidly, require special preservation or adhere to bottles, or where compositing can mask the presence of some contaminants through dilution. See Section 10 of Evaluation Protocol (SQIDEP) for Stormwater Quality Treatment Devices - Consultation Release for details.	NA		
Sampling Location	Inflow, outflow and overflow/bypass. Where the sampling of treated flow is impractical, a float switch or similar must be used to detect and record when bypass has occurred. Sampling locations are to be identified and agreed in the submitted Quality Assurance ProjectPlan.	Y		
Maintenance	A typical/standard maintenance program must be in operation during the assessment period. A statutory declaration from the	A statutory declaration from the manufacturer as to the maintenance regime must be provided.	Statutory declaration from the Michael Wicks, Director Ocean Protect, stating the system has been maintained in accordance with	



Requirement	Field Evidence Criteria	AWC Assessment / Compliance	Ocean Protect Response	
	manufacturer as to the maintenance regime must be provided.		typical/standard maintenance procedures	
Analytical Methods	Various and/or Standard Methods (for organic, inorganic and biological analysis as required). Must be NATA Registered laboratory for samples.	Y		
Chemical and Physical Analytes	 Particle size distribution Total suspended solids (TSS) or suspended solids content (mg/L) Total phosphorus (TP) Filterable reactive phosphorus Particulate Phosphorus Total Nitrogen (TN) Dissolved Nitrogen Total Oxidised Nitrogen Ammonium Nitrogen 	The following analytes were not sampled: • Particle size distribution	 PSD results from samples taken during the Australian study: ES2002497 is for the storm WSUFT-200124 which has been included in the submission. It has influent and effluent PSD ES1833278 is for the storm WSUFT-181107 which was also included in the submission. It only has the influent PSD 	
Flow Measurement Location	Inlet, Outlet and Bypass, as applicable. Based on relevant accepted measurement protocols for flow type (e.g. open channel, in pipe)	Y		
Precipitation Measurement	Automatic onsite rain gauge ³	Y		
Recording Intervals	1 minute or less	Y		
Recording Increments	No greater than 0.25mm	Y		
Rain Gauge Calibration	Twice during verification period	Ocean Protect's response to same SQIDEP requirement: "The rain gauge is factory- calibrated and needs no further Adjustment. But does require check for debris periodically. Which we have done. We have also used two rain gauges		



Requirement	Field Evidence Criteria	AWC Assessment / Compliance	Ocean Protect Response	
		to check against each other and found no inconsistencies. This detail is now provided in report".		
Performance indicators	TSS, TN and TP	Y		
Data points to be excluded	 TSS, TN or TP EMC for an individual event if the EMC is greater than one standard deviation from the overall mean for all events and greater than one standard deviation from the mean values presented in Table 2. Individual stormwater event TSS, TP and TP EMC data if the PSD is outside the ranges provided in Figure 1. Where there is only limited PSD data is provided and the PSD is outside the ranges provided in Figure 1 then all data is excluded. TN EMC data when the 	Ocean Protect to Review and provide details	 Updated spreadsheet with the WSU data and calculations. On sheet "Table 3 - WSU Data" from row 149, I've excluded any results that doesn't comply with the Gold Coast SQID protocol criteria In summary, 18, 20 and 14 events qualify for TSS, TP and TN respectively. TSS ER doesn't change, but TP and TN ER reduce slightly (~5 and 6% respectively). 	
	dissolved and particulate requirements in Table 3 are not achieved.			
Performance indicators ⁴	• Efficiency ratio (ER = 1 – mean EMCout/ mean EMCin)	Y		
	 Median Concentration Reduction Efficiency (CRE = (EMCin - EMCout) / EMCin) for each event is calculated then median of the CRE's is calculated) Where there is close agreement between the parameters above then adopt the efficiency ratio. Where there is greater than 10% difference between the 			



Requirement	Field Evidence Criteria	AWC Assessment / Compliance	Ocean Protect Response	
	two parameters adopt the average.			
	Performance curve with trend line			
	Preferred approach as this allows different % reductions to be nominated for different inflow concentrations			
Performance Variability Schematics	Box and Whisker Plot	Y		
Statistical Significance Testing	Log-transformed inlet and outlet paired samples at 95% confidence level	Y	Updated spreadsheet with the WSU data and calculations, specifically in the sheet "Statistics significance testing"	

G.1 Preamble

This appendix describes the methodology and results of an assessment of the life cycle costs of Filterra® biofiltration systems and other stormwater quality asset types for an example 'typical' site.

G.2 Methodology

G.2.1 Software

The eWater CRC MUSIC software (Version 6) has been used in this assessment. This is the latest version of MUSIC (at the time of report writing). MUSIC was used to model the stormwater flows and pollutant loads generated from the example site and assess the treatment performance of the given stormwater treatment assets. The life cycle costing module within MUSIC was also used to analyse the life cycle costs of the assets and associated 'cost effectiveness' (given as an average 'equivalent annual payment' of pollution removed per year).

G.2.2 Source nodes

Within MUSIC, the user is required to specify source nodes. The source nodes represent the stormwater flow and pollutant generating areas of the site.

For the purposes of this assessment, a 'typical' development site was assumed. The assumed land usage was 'residential', with rainfall-runoff and pollutant export properties in accordance with Water By Design (2010). The site was assumed to be one hectare in area, which was separated into roof, road, and 'other' ground level areas (35%, 30% and 35% of the site respectively), with imperviousness values in accordance with Water By Design (2010) of 100, 70 and 30% respectively.

G.2.3 Treatment scenarios & nodes

The following stormwater treatment scenarios were modelled:

- Jellyfish®, with OceanGuard™ for road areas
- StormFilter®, with OceanGuard™ for road areas
- Filterra® biofiltration tree pits
- Filterra® biofiltration basin
- 'Typical' biofiltration at-street tree pits
- 'Typical' biofiltration at-street 'garden beds'
- 'Typical' bioretention basin
- Constructed wetland

For each scenario, the assets were sized to achieve operational phase pollutant load removal targets in accordance with the *State planning policy* (DILGP 2017). These criteria are provided in Table G-1.

 Table G-1
 Operational Phase Performance Criteria

Pollutant	Criteria
Total Suspended Solids	80% reduction
Total Phosphorus	60% reduction
Total Nitrogen	45% reduction
Gross Pollutants (5mm or larger)	90% reduction

The properties of the treatment nodes for each scenario are summarised in Table G-2. An example layout of one of the MUSIC models used in the analyses is provided in Figure G-1.

Treatment scenario	Description
Jellyfish® with OceanGuard™	7 OceanGuards [™] (treating ground and road runoff only). Modelled as a 'GPT' treatment node with high flow bypass of 0.14m ³ /s. Performance determined by node transfer functions (approx. average annual TSS, TP, TN and GP load removals of 81%, 30%, 21% and 100%).
	Jellyfish® with 2250mm-diam. manhole (5 high flow, 1 drain down) 6 cartridges. Modelled as generic treatment node with flows (up to high flow bypass of 0.0275m ³ /s) having reduced TSS, TP, TN and GP concentrations of 89, 65, 54, and 99% respectively.
StormFilter® with OceanGuard™	7 OceanGuards [™] (treating ground and road runoff only). Modelled as a 'GPT' treatment node with high flow bypass of 0.14m ³ /s. Performance determined by node transfer functions (approx. average annual TSS, TP, TN and GP load removals of 81%, 30%, 21% and 100%)
	17 x 690 PSorb cartridges. Modelled as a 'detention' node and 'generic' node. Detention node with $5.2m^2$ surface area, 0.77m extended detention depth, zero performance volume, zero exfiltration, 91mm equivalent pipe diam., 2m overflow width, and zero treatment (k = 1 for TSS, TP and TN). Generic node with high flow bypass of 0.0153m ³ /s) with reduced TSS, TP, TN and GP concentrations of 99.6, 86, 56, and 100% respectively.
Filterra® biofiltration tree pits	Modelled as a bioretention node, 150mm extended detention depth, 30m ² surface and filter area (0.3% of catchment), zero exfiltration, 3550mm/ hour saturated hydraulic conductivity, 0.53m filter depth, 500mg/kg total nitrogen, 1mg/kg ortho-phosphate concentration, vegetated with nutrient effective plants.
Filterra® bioretention basin	3m overflow width, under-drain present, no submerged zone.
Typical bioretention tree pits	Modelled as a bioretention node, 100mm extended detention depth, 130m ² surface and filter area (1.3% of catchment), zero exfiltration, 200mm/ hour saturated hydraulic conductivity, 0.5m filter depth, 400mg/kg total nitrogen, 30mg/kg ortho-phosphate concentration, vegetated with nutrient effective plants, 13m overflow width, under-drain present, no submerged zone.
Typical biofiltration 'rain gardens'	As per bioretention tree pits, but with 150mm extended detention depth.
Typical biofiltration basin	As per typical bioretention tree and rain gardens, but with 100m ² surface and filter area (1.0% of catchment), and 300mm extended detention depth.
Wetland	Modelled as wetland treatment node. 100m ³ inlet pond volume, 1000m ² surface area, 0.3m extended detention depth, 300m ³ permanent pool volume (and initial volume), zero exfiltration, and 48 hour detention time.

Table G-2 Treatment node properties for modelled scenarios



Figure G-1 Example layout of MUSIC model used in cost abatement analyses

G.2.4 Life cycle costing properties

The life cycle costing properties applied are summarised in Table G-3.

Parameter	Value	Comments	
Real discount rate	1.8%	From Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (2017)	
Annual inflation rate	2.5%		
Base year for costing	2019	Year at time of analysis	
Span of analysis	50 years	In accordance with Water By Design (2010)	

Table G-3 Applied life cycle costing properties

MUSIC requires values to be specified for acquisition, establishment, maintenance, renewal and decommissioning costs. Table G-4 provides a summary of the life cycle cost values for the modelled scenarios.

Scenario	Acquisition cost (\$)	Annual maintenance cost (\$/year)	Annualised renewal costs (\$/year)	Annualised maintenance & renewal costs (\$/year)	Lifespan (years)
Jellyfish® with OceanGuard™	58047 – 60949	4255	5495	9750	25
StormFilter® with OceanGuard™	53981	4239–8025	-	4239 – 8025	25
Filterra® biofiltration tree pits	191221	4147–27225	1089 – 2723	5236 – 29948	50
Filterra® bioretention basin	23100	1885–3770	990 – 2475	2875 – 6245	50
Typical bioretention tree pits	141700 – 1133600	14760–49201	2834 – 22672	17594 – 71873	50
Typical biofiltration 'rain gardens'	70850 – 283400	1417–4251	1417 – 5668	2834 – 9919	50
Typical biofiltration basin	38150 – 109000	545	763 – 2180	1308 – 2725	50
Wetland	119900 – 179850	2398–11990	2398 – 3597	4796 – 15587	50

 Table G-4
 Summary of life cycle cost values for modelled scenarios

Costs for OceanGuard[™], Jellyfish®, StormFillter®, and Filterra® biofiltration systems have been sourced from an extensive database of cost information for these assets collated by Ocean Protect. It is anticipated that these costs are accurate as they are based on real cost data for several thousand projects by Ocean Protect.

Unit cost information for 'typical' bioretention systems and wetlands was sourced from Melbourne Water (2013) and adjusted for inflation – with the exception of annualised renewal costs for these asset types (in the absence of values from Melbourne Water (2013), which was assumed to be equal to approximately 2% of total acquisition cost (as suggested by eWater (2014)). Decommissioning costs were assumed to be zero for all assets. It is anticipated that these costs are approximate only.

For each scenario, 'low (typical)' and high cost scenarios were applied. The 'low (typical)' cost values would be representative of 'typical' costs anticipated for these systems, recognising that these costs are likely to be 'low' within the normal range of costs required for these assets (and near the recommended minimum values for maintenance and renewal expenditure). The 'high' cost values would be anticipated to be 'high' within the normal range of costs required for these assets.

G.3 Results

The results of the life cycle cost analyses in terms of calculated acquisition, maintenance and renewal and equivalent annual payment (EAP) for TSS, TP and TN removal is summarised in Table G-5 and the figures below.

Scenario	Life cycle cost (\$)	EAP (\$/year)	EAP for TSS removal (\$/kg/year)	EAP for TP removal (\$/kg/year)	EAP for TN removal (\$/kg/year)
Jellyfish® with OceanGuard™	391339 – 396099	7827 – 7922	6.0 - 6.0	4430 – 4484	987 – 999
StormFilter® with OceanGuard™	222924 – 343079	4458 – 6862	3.6 - 5.6	2331 – 3588	606 – 932
Filterra® biofiltration tree pits	359359 – 1386108	7187 – 27722	6.0 – 23.2	3154 – 12168	797 – 3073
Filterra® bioretention basin	107449 – 199719	2149 – 3994	1.8 – 3.7	943 – 1950	238 – 492
Typical bioretention tree pits	694462 – 3335443	13889 – 66709	12.4 – 59.5	6943 – 33347	1784 – 8567
Typical biofiltration 'rain gardens'	69097 – 533004	1382 – 10660	1.2 – 9.3	671 – 5179	166 – 1304
Typical biofiltration basin	84160 – 164261	1683 – 3285	1.5 – 2.9	801 – 1596	203 – 395
Wetland	240715 – 685569	4814 – 13711	4.3 – 12.2	2378 – 6773	587 – 1672

Table G-5 Summary of life cycle cost results for modelled scenarios



Figure G-2 Graph of calculated acquisition costs for modelled scenarios



Figure G-3 Graph of calculated maintenance and renewal costs for modelled scenarios



Figure G-4 Graph of calculated life cycle costs for modelled scenarios



Figure G-5 Graph of calculated EAP for TSS removal for modelled scenarios
Cost Abatement Analyses for Filterra® Biofiltration Systems and Other Stormwater Treatment Asset Types



Figure G-6 Graph of calculated EAP for TP removal for modelled scenarios



Figure G-7 Graph of calculated EAP for TN removal for modelled scenarios

Cost Abatement Analyses for Filterra® Biofiltration Systems and Other Stormwater Treatment Asset Types

Key findings from the above results for the modelled scenarios include the following:

- Filterra® biofiltration basins likely have the lowest acquisition costs, whilst tree pits (Filterra® and conventional biofiltration tree pits) have the highest.
- Conventional biofiltration basins likely have the lowest maintenance and renewal costs, whilst conventional tree pits have the highest maintenance and renewal costs
- Conventional biofiltration basins likely have the lowest EAP for pollutant removal, whist conventional tree pits likely have the highest.
- Filterra® biofiltration basins likely have the second lowest EAP for pollutant removal, and second lowest maintenance and renewal costs.
- Wetlands likely have an acquisition cost lower only than the tree pit options, and likely have a higher EAP for pollutant removal (and maintenance and renewal cost) than the StormFilter® and OceanGuard[™] scenario.

G.4 Discussion

It should be noted that the above analysis has the following limitations:

- One climate (Brisbane, 1980 to 1989) and land usage (residential) scenario has been modelled
- Land costs have been excluded from the analysis. This is particularly relevant for stormwater treatment assets (particularly wetlands and conventional biofiltration systems) that require significant land area to be appropriately integrated
- Costs for typical biofiltration and wetland asset types should be considered approximate only.

Nevertheless, the above analysis shows that Filterra® biofiltration basins was likely the second most cost-effective stormwater treatment scenario (noting that land costs for assets are excluded from the analysis) – and only requires more maintenance and renewal expenditure than a conventional bioretention basins. This indicates that Filterra® biofiltration basins may be a preferred asset type – particularly when space is constrained.

Traditionally, proprietary stormwater treatment asset types (such as StormFilter® and OceanGuard[™]) are not accepted in public owned land by local government in Australia due to perceived higher operational (e.g. maintenance and renewal) costs than other 'natural' stormwater treatment assets, such as biofiltration and wetlands. The aforementioned analysis shows, however, that estimated maintenance and renewal costs for wetlands are relatively high – higher than the modelled StormFilter® and OceanGuard[™] scenario. This indicates that the perception of proprietary stormwater treatment assets being a larger maintenance burden is likely erroneous (at least for some asset types).

Appendix H Results of Filterra® filter media sampling & analyses

This appendix provides the laboratory results of Filterra® filter media testing, as summarised in Table 2-4.

H.1 Sample collection & analysis

Table H-1 provides a summary of the Samples of Filterra® filter media have been collected and analysed from the following locations:

 Table H-1
 Summary of locations for Filterra® filter media sampling and analyses

Site location	Date of installation	Date of sampling	Comments
Supply from Ocean Protect	N/A	13 February 2019	Filter media had not been used. Two samples collected and analysed.
Western Sydney University,	April 2018	1 March 2019	See Table 2-2, Table 2-3 and Appendix B and for further information about site.
Kingswood		14 February 2020	Samples collected from one location in March 2019 and two locations in February 2020 within system, from the top, middle and bottom of the Filterra® filter media.
Warwick Farm racecourse, Sydney, NSW	November 2017	12 August 2019	Samples collected at four locations across the system shown in top photo of Figure 2-1 (approximately evenly distributed across the system).
			Samples collected from the top, middle and bottom of the Filterra® filter media.

Samples were collected by Ocean Protect staff and delivered to ALS on ice (<4° C) and accompanied by chain-of-custody documentation and analysis was carried out in accordance with Table B-2.

Table H-2	Water	quality	analytical	parameters a	and	methods for the site
-----------	-------	---------	------------	--------------	-----	----------------------

Parameter	Abbreviation	Analytical method	Limit of Reporting		
Electrical Conductivity (1:5)	EC	EA010	1 µS/cm		
Moisture content	MC	EA055	0.1%		
Nitrite and Nitrate as N (NOx) – Soluble by Discrete Analyser	NOx	EK059G	0.1 mg/kg		
TKN as N By Discrete Analyser	TKN	EK061G	20 mg/kg		
Total Nitrogen as N (TKN + NOx) By Discrete Analyser	TN	EG062G	20 mg/kg		
Reactive Phosphorus as P- Soluble By Discrete Analyser	RP	EK071G	0.1 mg/kg		

H.2 Results & Discussion

Table H-3 provides a summary of the results from the Filterra® sampling and analyses.

Site	Date of sampling	Location ID	Depth	EC (µS/cm)	MC (%)	NOx (mg/kg)	TKN (mg/kg)	TN (mg/kg)	DP (mg/kg)
Supply from Ocean Protect	13 Feb	А	N/A	28	0.3	1.7	160	160	<0.1
	2019	В		34	0.3	1.7	200	200	<0.1
		Average		31	0.3	1.7	180	180	<0.1
Western	1 Mar 2019	-	Тор	14	2.3	0.9	620	620	0.2
Sydney University,		-	Middle	13	2.2	0.5	330	330	0.1
Kingswood		-	Bottom	14	2.0	1	370	370	<0.1
		Average		13.7	2.2	0.8	440	440	0.1
	14 Feb 2020	А	Тор	41	4.5	8.8	450	460	0.1
		А	Middle	21	4.2	6.0	270	280	<0.1
		А	Bottom	22	4.5	5.2	380	380	<0.1
		В	Тор	26	4.5	8.7	390	400	0.2
		В	Middle	24	4.7	6.2	300	310	<0.1
		В	Bottom	21	3.4	5.6	300	300	<0.1
		Average		25.8	4.3	6.8	348	355	<0.1
Warwick	12 Aug 2019	А	Тор	22	2.5	1.2	270	270	0.6
Farm race course, Sydney, NSW		А	Middle	12	2.9	0.6	220	220	0.3
		А	Bottom	10	4	0.5	200	200	0.3
		В	Тор	18	2.4	0.9	280	280	1.4
		В	Middle	13	3.1	1	180	180	0.8
		В	Bottom	13	3.7	1	200	200	0.6
		С	Тор	24	5.2	1.8	490	490	1.4
		С	Middle	15	1.6	0.6	300	300	0.6
		С	Bottom	17	1.1	0.2	200	200	0.5
		D	Тор	22	3.6	2.8	300	300	0.8
		D	Middle	15	1.5	0.6	140	140	0.3
		D	Bottom	17	1.3	0.5	200	200	0.4
		Average for top		21.5	3.4	1.7	335	335	1.05
		Average for middle		13.8	2.3	0.7	210	210	0.50
		Average for bottom		14.3	2.5	0.6	200	200	0.45
		Avera	ige	16.5	2.7	1	248	248	0.7

 Table H-3
 Summary of Filterra® biofiltration system filter media test results

Key findings from the above results are:

- Moisture content and nutrient concentrations within the operating Filterra® biofiltration systems is typically higher at the top and lower at the bottom. This would be anticipated given that incoming stormflows (and direct rainfall) enter the system at the surface.
- Nutrient concentration within the operating Filterrra® biofiltration systems are higher than that present within the un-used filter media. This is anticipated given that the media would accumulate some nutrients over time due to incoming nutrient loads (from stormwater) and possible leaching of nutrients from the vegetation and mulch layer.
- The nutrient concentrations within the filter media at the Western Sydney University site did not increase between the March 2019 and February 2020 sampling events. Instead, TKN, TN and DP concentrations decreased between the sampling.
- The nutrient concentrations within the filter media at the Warwick Farm system is significantly lower than that observed in the Western Sydney University system.

Appendix I Filterra® filter media nutrient concentrations for MUSIC Modelling

As outlined in Section 3, MUSIC is the preferred tool for demonstrating the performance of stormwater quality treatment systems and it is recommended that the MUSIC bioretention node be applied in assessing the performance of Filterra® biofiltration systems.

The MUSIC bioretention node allows the model user to specify values for parameters known to have significant influence on the performance of biofiltration systems, including filter media properties. The predicted performance of biofiltration systems (as predicted by MUSIC) is sensitive to the total nitrogen and orthophosphate concentration of the filter media of biofiltration systems (Healthy Land and Water 2018), including Filterra® biofiltration systems.

Healthy Land and Water (2018) states that, when modelling to demonstrate compliance with stormwater treatment objectives, the user should assume TN and orthophosphate concentrations of 400 and 30mg/kg respectively, or the actual value of orthophosphate in the filter media as established through testing of the supplied filter media.

Initial nitrogen and orthophosphate concentrations from other commercially available biofiltration filter media is known to be well below the aforementioned values recommended by Healthy Land and Water (2018). It is, however, anticipated that some increase in filter media TN and orthophosphate concentrations would occur over time, due to a combination of incoming stormwater flows, direct rainfall and vegetation and mulch leaching – although minimal information is available in relation to the likely long-term change in TN and orthophosphate concentrations within bioretention filter media.

Glaister et al (2013)'s paper "*Long-Term Phosphorus Accumulation in Stormwater Biofiltration Systems at the Field Scale*" described the investigations (and associated results). Glaister et al (2013) measured the filter media ortho-phosphate concentrations within six bioretention systems in Brisbane and Melbourne, that had been operating from between five and twelve years, with homogenised samples measured at the following depth intervals: 0-10mm; 10-20mm; 20-40mm; 40-80mm; 80-120mm; 150-200mm and; 300-350mm. The results showed that:

- ortho-phosphate concentrations were typically very low (between approximately 5 and 20mg/kg) at depths greater than approximately 150mm (from the filter media surface).
- Higher concentrations were typically observed at the inlet of the assed bioretention systems and/ or within the top 100mm of the filter media (although it should be noted that none of the devices have any form of stormwater pre-treatment).
- No clear signs of phosphorus "breakthrough" were observed, offering positive reinforcement that current biofilter design specifications are producing systems which function well (and continue to remove phosphorus) in the long-term.

As shown by the analyses of Filterra® biofiltration systems (described in Appendix H), nutrient concentration within operating Filterra® biofiltration systems was observed to be higher than that present within the un-used (supplied) filter media. Based on the results obtained to date (described in Appendix H), it is recommended that Filterra® biofiltration systems modelled in MUSIC using a bioretention node to demonstrate performance with stormwater management objectives assume TN and orthophosphate concentrations of 500 and 1mg/kg respectively.