



Stormwater Management Manual

Bureau of Environmental Services

1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Room 613, Portland, OR 97204-3713

503-823-7740 • BESStormManual@portlandoregon.gov

portland.gov/bes/SWMM

Date: January 23, 2023

By: Henry Stevens

Reviewed By: Adrienne Aiona

Soil Specification for Green Streets with Underdrains & Rock Galleries

Introduction

This document provides background and supporting information for a new BES green streets soil specification requiring more combined silt and clay than BES' 2020 standard soil blend. The new specification is for all systems with underdrains or rock galleries¹. The new specification addresses concerns about plant stress and mortality during dry periods in systems with underdrains or rock galleries, particularly in lined systems where roots don't have access to native soil. The new specification is based on BES field trials over the last ten years with soil blends containing loam. The primary source of the details for the new specification is the trial soil blend for the Slough 104B project (Project E10625/2018). BES recently completed a three-year monitoring program for that project.

Table of Contents

1. History and Background
 - The 2008 Standard Soil Specification
 - Construction of Test Facilities with soil Blends Containing Loam, 2012 - 2017
 - Related Specifications from other Jurisdictions
2. The 2020 Standard Soil Specification
3. The Slough 104B Trial Soil Blend ("High-fines Blend")
 - Composition of the Blend
 - Monitoring Results – Winter Infiltration Rates and Moisture Retention
4. The 2023 Soil Specification for Green Streets with Underdrains
 - Composition of the Blend
 - Other Components of the Specification
5. References

¹ BES continues to use the standard soil blend in infiltrating green streets facilities, where plant roots have access to native soil.

and produced several different blends using the same feedstocks. The same was true for the gradation results obtained during the making of the trial blend for the Slough 104B project. The opposite should be true based on the dilution of the fines content with the addition of compost, and these outcomes contributed to the conclusion by staff that blenders of the 2008 standard soil blend were meeting the specified fines content (5-15%) by blending sand and compost without any addition of topsoil.

3. The Slough 104B Trial Soil Blend (“High-fines Blend”)

Composition of the Blend

In 2018 BES constructed the Slough 104B Project, a neighborhood green streets project including 53 facilities. About half the facilities were built with a trial blend that’s the basis for the new soil specification. The other half were built with a soil blend meeting BES’ 2008 standard specification. The project incorporated an experimental design allowing comparison of infiltration, soil moisture, and plant health results for the two different blends and other design variables.

BES staff selected the composition of the 104B trial blend based on the recommendation of a 2017 memorandum which summarizes results from prior BES trials with blended soils containing loam (Herrera, 2017). The Slough 104B trial blend is 50% sand, 30% loam, 10% aged dark hemlock mulch, and 10% compost. The tested fines content (silt+clay) was roughly 19% in the mineral blend and the estimated fines content in the final blend, including compost, was about 15% based on the mixing proportions and the typical fines content of compost. The tested fines content in the final blend was about 18% - see discussion in the preceding section about the potential for inconsistencies in results for sieve tests containing compost.

The Slough 104B trial blend contains about 1/3rd the percentage of compost contained in the 2008 standard soil blend. The hypothesis is that with less compost the blend will export lower levels of nutrients; BES is beginning year four of a four-year water quality monitoring program to confirm the hypothesis. Note that other jurisdictions such as the State of Maryland have had long-term success using bioretention soil blends without compost to limit the nutrient export associated with compost.

Substituting some of the compost with aged, dark bark mulch makes sense for multiple reasons. It should be more stable and consistent. Staff have observed wide variation in the appearance and particle size distribution of yard-debris compost. Some of the variability can be attributed to changes in feedstocks over the course of the year: sometimes feedstocks are dominated by grass cuttings; at other times the composition is mostly trimmed woody material and leaves. Yard debris decomposes relatively quickly; aged bark mulch should break down more slowly and provide a longer-term source of carbon for the system. Given the age of the bark mulch - six months is the standard minimum aging time in the industry - the material is already partly decomposed and unlikely to cause significant immobilization of nutrients by microbes. It’s more fibrous and rigid than yard-debris compost, providing more soil structure (porosity) as a bulking agent.

The Slough 104B trial soil specification includes a requirement for surface mulch. Without mulch an exposed soil with more silt and clay is likely vulnerable to erosion and separation of the fines from the coarser particles, which can result in deposition of fines, crusting, and sealing. Mulch also provides some protection from compaction by foot traffic. In 2012 BES conducted field tests comparing summer soil moisture in the imported soil blend in green street facilities with and without mulch (BES, 2012). The

results confirmed the soil in the facilities with surface mulch remained more moisture than the soil in systems without mulch.

Monitoring Results – Winter Infiltration Rates and Moisture Retention

The potential for unacceptably low infiltration rates is one of the primary concerns about bioretention soil blends containing more than a small percentage of loam. It therefore was an important part of the monitoring program for the Slough 104B project to confirm drawdown rates at facilities containing the trial soil blend.

In February 2022 BES staff completed drawdown tests at seven lined facilities containing the trial soil blend. The systems were constructed in 2018 and had fully-established plantings² by the time of the testing. Final drawdown results ranged from 5-12 in/hr after four successive fillings during the day-long testing. That range is substantially lower than the range for a group of lined facilities containing the standard blend that BES tested using a similar approach in 2017 (BES, 2017). However the average for the final drawdown results is well above BES’ design infiltration assumption of 6 in/hr (2020 SWMM). There have been no reports of extended ponding or evidence of clogging in any of the 27 Slough 104B facilities containing the trial soil blend.

Since January 2022 BES has been comparing average soil moisture in three facilities with the standard soil blend vs. results for three facilities with the trial soil blend. There are three moisture sensors in each facility, installed at 8 inches below grade. The preliminary results indicate that after draining against gravity the trial soil consistently retains more moisture than the standard soil blend.

BES will provide more detailed results concerning infiltration and soil moisture in separate reports.

4. The 2023 Soil Specification for Green Streets with Underdrains

Composition of the Blend

The new soil specification is a modified version of the trial soil blend used in the Slough 104B Project. In August 2022 a committee of BES staff³ endorsed the new specification after reviewing results from the Slough 104B project and supporting information. See Figure 2 for a schematic showing the general blending proportions for the new specification.

Figure 2. Schematic: composition of the new soil specification

Components, by volume	Sand+Topsoil: 70%	Compost: 20%	Fir Bark: 10%
% passing #200 sieve, by wt.	20-30% silt+clay		

The total organic percentage by volume, including compost and aged fir bark, is similar to the organic content for the 2020 standard specification. The new specification is not designed to address concerns about nutrient export, so a significant percentage of compost is included to promote good plant establishment. Aged bark mulch is added as a bulking agent to help maintain porosity given the higher fines content in the blend; aged bark is stiffer and degrades more slowly than compost. Fir bark is

² Although there was some plant mortality during the extreme summer conditions in 2021, most of the tested facilities received “good” or “excellent” ratings for plant cover and health in June 2022.

³ The committee included representatives from GSI O&M, Materials Testing Lab (MTL), Engineering Services, Construction Management and Inspection, and Codes, Rules, and Manuals (CRM).

specified, rather than the hemlock bark used in the Slough 104B Project, given the much wider availability of fir bark compared with hemlock. As of fall 2022 it had become quite difficult to source hemlock bark mulch.

The range for particles passing the #200 sieve allows blends with more silt and clay than the Slough 104B trial blend. However, vendors are likely to target blends at the very low end of the allowed range (close to 20%) given their practice of minimizing the use of topsoil due to the potential for problems such as clumping and the difficulty of producing homogenous blends containing topsoil. In the judgement of BES staff, a specification allowing 20-30% fines presents a better balancing of potential risks than a range with 15-25%. The latter could result in the acceptance of blends with close to 15% fines, the mid-point of the range for the standard soil blend, with little potential for improving water retention.

The washed-sieve test for the new specification is the same as for the standard blend, but the ranges allowed for material passing the smaller sieves (e.g., #40 and #100) have been increased to accommodate more silt and clay. It is common for silty loams in the Portland area to contain more than 50% combined silt and clay. Blends meeting the new specification are unlikely to meet standard definitions for being “well graded”, but the goal is to continue to promote a broad range of particle sizes with a matrix of sand particles to provide stability. Table 2 shows the sieve ranges for the new specification.

Table 2. Sieves and allowed ranges

Sieve Size	Percent Passing
1 inch	100
#4	85-100
#10	50-100
#40	30-90
#100	20-60
#200	20-30

Other Components of the Specification

- The specification requires blending on a clean, hard surface such as asphalt or concrete for improved quality control.
- Two inches of surface mulch is required to protect the soil surface from erosion and compaction. The aged, dark fir bark specified for inclusion in the soil blend is also specified for the surface mulch given research showing aged organic material has a higher density and resists movement more than fresh organic material.

References

- Aspect Consulting, 2012. *Recommended Modification of the ASTM D2434 Procedures for Permeability Testing of Bioretention Soils*. Memorandum from J. Scott Kindred to Shanti Colwell, Seattle Public Utilities. Seattle, Washington.
- Auckland Council, 2013. *Mulch Specification for Stormwater Bioretention Facilities*. Technical Report 201/056, December 2013. <https://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/media/1673/tr2013-056-mulch-specification-for-stormwater-bioretention-devices.pdf>
- Emerson, C.H. and R.G. Traver, 2008. *Multiyear and seasonal variation of infiltration from storm-water best management practices*. Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering 134(5):598-605.
- Hart, T.D., 2017. *Root-enhanced Infiltration in Stormwater Bioretention Facilities in Portland, Oregon*. (doctoral dissertation) Portland State University, Portland, Oregon. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/3468/
- Herrera, 2014. *Long Term City of Seattle Bioretention Soil Mix Design Infiltration Rate Assumption for Modeling*. October 5, 2014. Memorandum to Shanti Colwell, Seattle Public Utilities.
- Herrera, 2017. *BES Project E10625/Slough 104B Green Streets: Selection of an Alternative Bioretention Soil Blend for Improved Water Quality Performance & Plant Health*. October 30, 2017. Memorandum from Kate Forester to BES Stormwater Management Manual Group. BES Internal report.
- Minnesota Stormwater Manual, 2021. *Design criteria for bioretention*, Materials specifications – filter media. See Mix D. https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/Design_criteria_for_bioretention
- Oregon State University (OSU) Extension Service, 1996. *Reference Manual for Judging Oregon Soils*, page 35. <https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/manual6>
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES), 2012. *Soil Bulk Density and Texture Survey of Portland Green Streets*. December 2012. Internal report, draft.
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES), 2012. *Soil Moisture Monitoring at Mulched Green Street Facilities Using Time Domain Reflectometry (TDR)*. December 2012. Internal report, draft.
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES), 2013. *Bench Scale Soil Column Testing to Improve Stormwater Facility Soil Specifications & Flow-Through (Lined) Facility Performance*. June 2013. Internal report.
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES), 2018. *Field Confirmation of the Hydraulic Performance of Older Lined Green Street Facilities with the 2008 Soil Blend*. May 2018. Internal report.

Taylor, A, and J. Wetzel, 2018. *Engineering Analysis of Plant and Fungal Contributions to Bioretention Performance*. *Water*, 2018. 10(9). (Contains water release curve for Washington Bioretention Soil Blend.)

Thompson, A.M., Paul, A.C., and Balster A. N., 2008. *Physical and Hydraulic Properties of Engineered Soil Media for Bioretention Basins*. *Transactions of the ASABE*. Vol.51(2): 499-514.

Washington State University (WSU), 2007. Bioretention Soil Mix Review and Recommendations for Western Washington. June 2007. Memorandum from Curtis Hinman to the Puget Sound Action Team.

Washington Stormwater Action Monitoring (SAM) program, *Orifice Control of Bioretention*, ongoing. [Washington SAM Grant Bioretention Orifice Control](#)

WRA Environmental Consultants, 2016. *Biotreatment Soil Media and Specification: Current Research on Trees and Water Quality Treatment*. Literature review. Prepared for BASMAA. San Francisco, September 14, 2016.

Toronto Engineering and Construction Services Division, 2021. Construction Specification for Growing Medium. September 2021. Published specification.