RYERSON UNIVERSITY

Modeling of Low Impact Development Nutrient Reduction Performance in the Lake Simcoe Watershed

James Li

May 5, 2020 08:30-10:15 HS7.3 EGU General Assembly 2020 Online

Agenda

- I. Project Description Lake Simcoe watershed
- GIS in Screening of Low Impact Development (LID)
 Opportunities
- 3. GIS in Development of Hydrologic Response Funcations (HRUs)
- 4. Development of HRU Hydrologic Models
- 5. Results of Application of HRU Models for all municipalities

Master Plan of LIDs for in the watershed (3400 km² and 20 municipalities)

- What and Where?

- What is the overall performance?

- What is the total Phosphorus reduction?





Lot Level LID Practices



Source: Li, J. et al. 2010 Evaluation of Low Impact Development Stormwater Technologies for the Uncontrolled Urban Areas in the Lake Simcoe Regions

Soakaway pit, dry well, rain harvesting, downspout disconnection, greenroof, bioretention cell, porous pavement, 17 combinations

Along ROW LID Practices



Source: Li, J. et al. 2010 Evaluation of Low Impact Development Stormwater Technologies for the Uncontrolled Urban Areas in the Lake Simcoe Regions

Bioretention area, grass channel, dry swale



Multiple-lot/Area LID Practices



Source: Li, J. et al. 2010 Evaluation of Low Impact Development Stormwater Technologies for the Uncontrolled Urban Areas in the Lake Simcoe Regions

Bioretention area, tree clusters



GIS in Screening of LID

Lot-based LID Opportunities

- Essential criteria for identifying potentially appropriate LID procedures for any particular lot:
 - soil depth
 - soil infiltration rate
 - slope steepness
 - Iand use
 - typical drainage area beyond setbacks
 - building sizes and other building-attribute details
 - land use categories
 - public land ownership

GIS in Screening of LID

ROW LID Opportunities

- Essential criteria for identifying potentially appropriate LID procedures for road allowances:
 - off the travelled portion and parking lanes
 - beyond assessment lot frontages
 - off sidewalks and parking lots
 - away from trees
 - in spaces between driveways
 - with sufficient width available to accommodate LIDs
 - with sufficient depth above bedrock and groundwater table
 - below slope steepness criteria along roadside
 - linked to the category of adjacent land use / road width

GIS in Screening of LID

Area-based LID Opportunities

- Inventory review
 - on public open space (parks, gores and natural areas)
 - off buildings, driveways and parking areas
 - on appropriate soils
 - away from treed areas
 - in acceptable slope range
 - with sufficient depth to bedrock and the water table
 - with soil of the appropriate hydrographic class

Data Issues

- Geographic resolution and registration
- Used GIS tools (selection by attributes, table join, selection by location/intersection, area calculation) to consolidate features into a consistent and coherent geodatabase

Buildings identified as being larger than their lots were clipped to lot bundaries



Parking lots (turquoise) were largely unclosed polygons which are unsuited for calculating impermeable portions of lots.



Data Issues continued

 Details of Roads' Rights of Way

> Used additional GIS tools (projection of polylines, assignment of topology rules to features, derivation of new polygon features by assembling polylines) for LID screening of roads and their rights of way:



Data Issues

- Roads and Rights of Way Data
 - New features that were generated:
 - road segments by surface material (paved/unpaved)
 - presence or absence of ditches
 - presence or absence of trees
 - and sufficient right-of-way space available to accommodate LIDs

Layers	Barrie	Newmarket East Gwillimbury		Aurora		
Parcels		Comprehensive (f	rom LSRCA/Teranet)			
Parking	Completed	Present	None	None		
Driveways	Present	None	None	None		
Buildings	Comprehensive (except attributes)	Comprehensive (except attributes)		None		
Land Use	Satisfa	ctory (from LSRCA and	d DMTI)	Comprehensive		
Sidewalks	Present	Require restructuring (lines)	None	Incomplete, lines		
Soils	Comp	lete (Hydrographic Cla	sses and Depths, from	LSRCA)		
Roads	Completed (lines)	Require restructuring (lines)	Present (lines)	Present (lines)		
Storm Drainage System	Present (lines)	Comprehensive	Present	Present		
Ditches	Present	None	None	None		
Parks	Present	Present	from LSRCA	Present		
DEM/DTM	M/DTM from LSRCA					

LID Screening

Screening of sites suited to each individual lot-based LID have been mapped, demonstrating that conditions are appropriate and choices exist



LID Screening sites for combinations of lot-based LIDs have now been demonstrated to be appropriate:





LID Screening of rights-of-way based LIDs have now also been demonstrated to be appropriate:



LID Screening of area-based LIDs have now also been demonstrated to be available:

Δ

Vertex 1	Microsoft Excel - Nag	laa Screening table for I	Barrie parks 110.xlsx		and the second second	-	-	11		
		LINOFFICIAL	TYPE		Park Area	In TracArca	Available Space	H of Available area	l .	
(R) 📣 (S)	2 Allandale Heights	Park	Park	CITY OF BARRIE	12146 03	121/6 03	121/6 03	100.00	Sepridge & Bayview	
	Anne St Gore	I GIK	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	1128 17	1128 17	12140.00	100.00	amphell Ave & Anne St	
	4 Brock Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	15157 15	15157.15		100.00	Brock and Sanford	
	5 Davidson St @ G	unn St	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	389.86	389.86		100.00	Davidson and gunn	
	6 Duckworth St @	St. Vincent St	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	855.88	855.88		100.00	ugenia and Duckworth	
	7 Gibbon Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	6967.42	6967.42		100.00	Sibbon and Anne	
	8 Jonathan Court		Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	146.91	146.91		100.00	oothwell and davidson	
	9 Lovers Court		Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	146.91	146.91		100.00	overs and Royal oak	
	10 Oakley Park Squa	ire	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	146.91	146.91		100.00	oak and grove	
	11 Patterson Place		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	4588.25	4588.25		100.00	Moon and Patterson	
	Lake Simcoe 12 Peacock Lane		Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	146.91	146.91		100.00	Peacock and thorncrest	
	13 St. Vincent St @ 0	Orchard Dr	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	146.91	146.91		100.00	St Vincent and Orchad	
	14 Allandale Station	Park	Park	CITY OF BARRIE	68580.71	68513.93		95.00	iffin & lakeshore	
	15 College Heights P	ark	Park	CITY OF BARRIE	12482.73	12482.73		95.00	Rose and Bernick	
	16 Elizabeth Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	9117.02	9117.02		95.00	lizabeth and James	
THEFT	17 John Edwin Coup	e Park	Park	CITY OF BARRIE	2399.71	2399.71		95.00	Vicdonald and Owen	
	18 Oates Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	4692.81	3883.61		95.00	dgehill and ferndale	
	19 Steel Street Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	9868.27	9868.27		95.00	Steel and cook	
J CATERE	Codrington Gore		Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	1743.52	1743.52		90.00	Codring and Lakeview	
	21 Innisfil Gore		Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	834.18	834.18		90.00	treed area	
	22 Minet's Point Rd	@ Lakeshore Dr	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	1261.56	1261.56		90.00	oster and yonge	
	23 Surrey Park		Park	CITY OF BARRIE	23475.46	20096.08		90.00	dgehill and ferndale	
	24	Irwin Natural Are	a Natural Area	CITY OF BARRIE	7505.17	5.40		90.00	Cundles and Anne	
		Strabane Park So	uth Park	CITY OF BARRIE	2020.61	2020.61		90.00	Look and Straban	
		Lovers Creek Rav	ine Natural Area	CITY OF BARRIE	27506.34	1221.63	20000 00	90.00	onge and Big Bay Point	
Sec	2/ 20	Whickey Crock C	rai Natural Area	CITY OF BARRIE	53437.69	33437.69	30000.00	89.72	big bay Point and Yonge	
	20 20 Machdomian Par	whiskey Creek So	Pork Rock	CITY OF BARRIE	26/16 56	4911.07	30000.00	89.72	Prove and St vincent	
	29 WacWorrison Pa	Dumonte Crock E	ast Natural Area		17057 90	10865 47	15000.00	08.04	Brock and Lorena	
	31 Scott Park	Dyments creek L	Park	CITY OF BARRIE	7511 55	7511 55	6250.00	83.21	STOCK and Lorena	
			FAIR		293.03	202.02	0250.00	80.00	onhia and Mcdonald	
	32 McDonald St @ S	ionhia St	Gore	(I I Y () F BARRIE				00.00		
	32 McDonald St @ S	iophia St	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	255.05	253.03				N
	32 McDonald St @ S H H Sheet1	ophia St Sheet2 / Sheet3 / 🗐	Gore	CITY OF BARRIE	255.05	233.03	0	1		41.00

GIS in Development of HRUs

Data Compilation: Records Needed for HRU development

- storm sewer networks including outfalls
- buildings:
 - roof area as a proportion of its land parcel
 - building height
 - building age
 - roof age
 - material
 - type (flat or sloping)
 - storm-sewer connectivity
- roads and their attributes:
 - presence or absence of ditches
 - surface material
 - paved area
 - right-of-way extent
- aerial photography
- precipitation records
- runoff data

Computational Approach



LID Combinations



LID Combination Connectivity **LID** Placement Assumptions Green Roof + Bio-Downspout Disconnection Lot Boundary **GR**: Retention Cell + **Green Roo**t Downspout • 75 % of roof area Disconnection • Draining to pervious (GR + BR + DD)area **BR**: • Treating parking and driveway runoff only Parking Lot (Impervious Area) **Bio-Retention Cell**



Lot-Based HRUs

Lot as a basic unit

Use of GIS screening results

- Hydrologic similarity
- LID opportunities

Procedure

- Examine the distribution of lots produced by screening
- Select three regions
- Select one lot to be modeled from each region (orthophotos)
- Model selected lots (existing and with LID)
- Develop HRU performance curves
 - Runoff reduction
 - Pollutant loading reduction



Areas for Modeling

Example: Soakaway pits in residential areas

Distribution and selection of regions





Areas for Modeling

Example: Soakaway pits in residential areas

Examining and selection of lots in each region



ROW HRUs

- ROW length as a basic unit
- Use of GIS screening results
 - Drainage area (road width)
 - LID opportunities
- Procedure
 - Examine the distribution of roads of different width
 - Model unit lengths of selected roads
 - Existing
 - With LID implementation
 - Develop HRU performance curves



Development of HRUs

HRU Modelling



Development of Area HRUs

- Manual screening of opportunities
 - Open spaces
 - Paved areas
 - Tree cover
 - Presence of sports facilities
 - Soil type
 - GW table
 - Drainage area
- Model individual areas



HRU Modelling in Barrie

- Population 177,061
- Total area 898 km²
- Uncontrolled drainage area
 - > 24 km² (1/5 of total uncontrolled area)
 - I 36 stormwatersheds
 - II,135 lots

Location	Total Number of Catchments	Total Urban Area (ha)		Uncontrolle	
			#	Area (ha)	% (area)
Aurora	210	2930.15	153	1941.49	66
Ballantrae	51	725.93	33	277.31	38
Barrie	198	3957.42	136	2446.64	62
Beaverton	38	254.34	38	254.34	100
Bradford	38	581.82	32	413.29	71
Cannington	17	106.96	15	94.69	89
Holland Landing	50	450.68	38	351.63	78
Innisfil	181	2116.87	150	1417.92	67
Keswick	96	899.54	83	602.38	71
Mount Albert	18	163.17	15	108.12	66
Newmarket	108	3104.03	51	1040.88	33.5
Orillia - Lake Simcoe	27	1468.13	27	1468.13	100
Pottageville	13	88.26	12	76.88	87
Schomberg/Lloydtown	27	149.40	23	113.43	76
Sharon	10	248.41	8	130.49	52.5
Sutton	49	306.58	48	269.44	88
Uxbridge	43	677.74	30	337.54	50
Totals	1174	18,229.43	892	11,344.60	62.2
Orillia – Lake Couchiching*	49	799.64	49	799.64	100



Modelling Inputs

Rainfall Data

- Barrie WPCP
- Hourly records 1968-2003 analyzed
- Average year (1985) precipitation used

Evapotranspiration

- Provided by LSRCA
- Barrie Creek Watershed used

Pollutant concentrations

- EMC based on Toronto WWFMMP Study
- Use of local data in the future



LID Sizing Assumptions

- Usually target-based (e.g. design events)
- LID Sizing assumptions
 - Lot-based Existing 2003 MOE guidelines
 - ROW TRCA/CVC LID Manual
 - Area TRCA/CVC LID Manual
- Typical pollutant removal assumed (literature)

Practice	TSS	ТР	Zinc
Bioretention	60 (15 to 75)	60 (-75 to 85)	65 (40 to 95)
Dry Well	90 (80 to 100)	50 (40 to 60)	90 (80 to 100)
Downspout Disconnection	nnection 100 100		100
Rainwater Harvesting	100 100		100
Permeable Pavement	75 (60 to 95)	65	75 (65 to 85)
Soakaway Pit	90 (60 to 95)	65 (50 to 95)	65 (65 to 85)
Green Roof	88	-80 (-242 to -69)	69
Grass Channel	(30 to 65)	15 (10 to 25)	
Dry Swale	80 (75 to 90)	83 (-45 to 60)	75 (60 to 85)



Aggregation of Results

Spreadsheet model

LID performance on stormwatershed basis (e.g. greenroof)

	Stormsoworshod	Applical	ble Area	RU	NOFF VOLUM	E CALCULAT	ION	
Stormsewershed	Δroa in	of LIDs		Total Runoff per	Runoff of Applicable Area,		, Bunoff Poduction	
ID Area,			in 9/	Stormsewershed,	in	m ³	Kulloli K	eduction
		in m	III 70	in m ³	(no LID)	(with LID)	in m ³	in %
BAR-C1	1,071,533	257,125	24.0	157,130	64,963	58,275	6,688	4.3



TOTAL PHOSPHORUS (TP) LOADING							
TP per	TP of Ap	plicable	TP Loading				
Stormsewershed,	Area, i	n kg/yr	Increasing				
in kg/yr	(no LID)	(with LID)	in kg/yr	in %			
108.1	35.9	36.4	-0.48	-0.44			

TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLID (TSS) LOADING						
TSS per Stormsewershed,	TSS of A Area, i	pplicable n kg/yr	TSS Loading Reduction			
in kg/yr	(no LID)	(with LID)	in kg/yr	in %		
24,572	4,779	3,596	1,184	4.8		

ZINC LOADING						
Zinc per Stormsewershed,	Zinc of A Area, i	pplicable n kg/yr	Zinc Loading Reduction			
in kg/yr	(no LID)	(with LID)	in kg/yr	in %		
43.2	26.0	20.7	5.2	12.1		



Watershed Municipalities

- Analyze Barrie results by land use
 - Loading rates for runoff and phosphorus
 - Reduction factors

		Land Use Types				
	Residential	Commercial	Resource and Industrial	Government and Institutional		
	All Lo	ots in City of Barrie				
Total Area, in ha	837.3	29.94	252.6	45.48		
Without LID						
Total Runoff Volume, in m3	1,406,226	93,825	679,459	85,535		
TP, in kg/yr	1,153	49	353	44		
TSS, in kg/yr	333,697	5,038	36,487	4,593		
Zinc, in kg/yr	215	40	292	37		
	Lots a	after GIS Screening				
	Re	duction Factors				

- Assemble land use distribution in all municipalities
- Apply loading and reduction factors

Aggregation of Modeling Results in BarriePerformance Maps: Lot-based: Individual LIDs





Aggregation of Modeling Results in Barrie

Performance Maps: Combinations of lot-based LIDs





Aggregation of Results in Lake Simcoe

Performance Maps: Combinations of lot-based LIDs





Potential Loading Benefits of Lot-level LIDs in Lake Simcoe

	TD Looding of	TP Loading		g, in t/yr	
Names of Cities/Townships	Existing Condition (without LID), in t/yr	РР	BR+PP	DD	DW+PP
CITY OF ORILLIA	0.65	0.23	0.22	0.19	0.30
TOWN OF AURORA	1.18	0.49	0.35	0.36	0.46
TOWN OF BRADFORD-WEST GWILLIMBURY	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03
TOWN OF EAST GWILLIMBURY	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.08
TOWN OF GEORGINA	0.46	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.22
TOWN OF INNISFIL	0.95	0.33	0.32	0.28	0.44
TOWN OF NEWMARKET	0.98	0.39	0.34	0.30	0.44
TOWN OF WHITCHURCH-STOUFFVILLE	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04
TOWNSHIP OF BROCK	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.05
TOWNSHIP OF KING	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
TOWNSHIP OF RAMARA	0.00	-	-	-	-
TOWNSHIP OF SEVERN	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
TOWNSHIP OF UXBRIDGE	0.22	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.10
CITY OF BARRIE	2.08	0.66	0.45	0.50	0.60
Total	7.04	2.53	2.11	1.99	2.79

Potential % Reduction of Lot-level LIDs in Lake Simcoe

	Runoff re	duction(%)	TP redu	ction(%)
Names of Cities/Townships	РР	BR+PP	DD	DW+PP
CITY OF ORILLIA	36	38	30	46
TOWN OF AURORA	44	30	31	39
TOWN OF BRADFORD-WEST GWILLIMBURY	45	38	31	46
TOWN OF EAST GWILLIMBURY	34	38	30	46
TOWN OF GEORGINA	38	41	30	48
TOWN OF INNISFIL	35	38	30	46
TOWN OF NEWMARKET	42	37	30	45
TOWN OF WHITCHURCH-STOUFFVILLE	37	35	30	44
TOWNSHIP OF BROCK	35	39	30	47
TOWNSHIP OF KING	34	38	30	46
TOWNSHIP OF RAMARA	0	0	0	0
TOWNSHIP OF SEVERN	34	38	30	46
TOWNSHIP OF UXBRIDGE	37	37	30	45
CITY OF BARRIE	33	21	24	29

Costs of Lot-level LIDs in Lake Simcoe

	Capital & 20 year O&M Cost (\$M)			
Names of Cities/Townships	РР	BR+PP	DD	DW+PP
CITY OF ORILLIA	17.8	94.2	1.2	24.3
TOWN OF AURORA	46.7	134.7	1.8	58.9
TOWN OF BRADFORD-WEST				
GWILLIMBURY	2.3	6.7	0.1	4.3
TOWN OF EAST GWILLIMBURY	4.2	25.2	0.3	5.1
TOWN OF GEORGINA	14.2	65.8	0.8	24.7
TOWN OF INNISFIL	24.4	142.0	1.8	28.8
TOWN OF NEWMARKET	35.9	124.0	1.6	60.7
TOWN OF WHITCHURCH-STOUFFVILLE	2.7	13.4	0.2	2.7
TOWNSHIP OF BROCK	3.0	17.1	0.2	4.2
TOWNSHIP OF KING	0.7	4.0	0.1	0.8
TOWNSHIP OF RAMARA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOWNSHIP OF SEVERN	1.1	6.6	0.1	1.3
TOWNSHIP OF UXBRIDGE	6.4	31.8	0.4	8.4
CITY OF BARRIE	61.6	181.9	2.5	60.1

ROW LIDs in the City of Barrie

	Overall Reduction								
	Run	Runoff TP		TSS		Zinc			
ROW LID	m³/yr	%	t/yr	%	t/yr	%	t/yr	%	Cost(\$M)
BR	43,821	5.3	0.1	16.4	44.6	16.4	0.043	17.3	55.6
GC	2,800	0.3	0.002	0.6	3.2	1.2	0.002	1.0	1.5

Marginal Costs of LIDs

Lot LID	\$/m³	\$/kg
PP	3	4,115
BR+PP	14	20,154
DD	0.3	251
DW+PP	4	5,037

Prioritization of Potential LID Areas



Prioritization of Potential LID Areas



Summary and Conclusions

- GIS analysis of LID feasibility requires high quality, good resolution, and consistent digital data throughout the study area.
- HRU approach
 - Allows watershed evaluation of implementation of small scale practices
 - Flexible
 - LID practices
 - Detailed modeling performance curves
 - Prioritization and ranking of future efforts