

**HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY STUDY IN
ENGINEERED SOIL MEDIA FOR
STORMWATER RUNOFF TREATMENT IN
BIORETENTION FACILITY**

HUSNA BINTI TAKAIJUDIN

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2017

**HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY STUDY IN ENGINEERED SOIL
MEDIA FOR STORMWATER RUNOFF TREATMENT IN
BIORETENTION FACILITY**

by

HUSNA BINTI TAKALJUDIN

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

May 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah s.w.t, The Most Gracious Merciful, with His blessed I have completed my thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). I want to express my deepest gratitude to the people who are involved and contribute to the completion of this project study.

I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Aminuddin Ab. Ghani; you have been a tremendous mentor for me. I am grateful to him for his support and opportunity to pursue my PhD degree at River Engineering and Urban Drainage Research Centre (REDAC), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM). Thank you for encouraging my research and for allowing me to grow as a research scientist. Your advices on both research as well as on my career have been priceless. My sincere thanks are extended for his patient to guide me throughout the duration of my PhD degree program. I would also like to thank my co-supervisors, Professor Dr. Nor Azazi Zakaria and Associate Professor Dr. Lau Tze Liang for assisting me a lot in completing of my research work in REDAC. Deep appreciations to Professor Dr. Nor Azazi Zakaria for allowing me to join the research work funded by Ministry of Higher Education under Long Term Research Grant (LRGS) No. 203/PKT/672004 entitled Urban Water Cycle Processes, Management and Societal Interactions: Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability. Special appreciation to Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS (UTP) for giving me financial support doing my PhD work in full-time basis.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the entire staff, administration officers, technical team of REDAC, especially Puan Nurul Azfa Azizan, En. Syafiq Shahrudin, Puan Khairul Rahmah Ayub and others whose interactions and opinions helped shaped this comprehensive research. Highly appreciation to technical support team of REDAC, especially En. Mohd Nor Arif Ahmad, Pn. Nor Mawati Mohamad and En. Zakariaansori Rahman whose provide a lot of attention and continuous assistance which lead to the success of this research project. Not to forget, special thanks to my colleagues especially Dr. Goh Hui Weng, Mazlina Alang Othman, and Nur Emilia Johari, who's preferably sharing happiness and sadness moments during PhD research works.

A special thanks to my family. Words cannot express how grateful I am to, my parents and my mother-in law for all of the sacrifices that you've made on my behalf. Your prayer for me was what sustained me thus far. I would also like to thank all of my friends who supported me in writing, and incented me to strive towards my goal. Special thanks to Pn. Salehah Puteh, who always at my side take care of my children and support me a lot during this research work. At the end I would like express appreciation to my beloved husband Mohamad Razali bin Abd.Wahab who was always my support in the moments when there was no one to answer my queries.

HUSNA BINTI TAKAIJUDIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xx
ABSTRAK	xxiii
ABSTRACT	xxv
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background Study	1
1.2 Problem Statements	3
1.3 Significance of Study	6
1.4 Objectives of Study	7
1.5 Scope of Works	7
1.6 Thesis Outline	8
CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Implication of Urbanization On Stormwater Runoff	10
2.2 Development of Bioretention System	14
2.3 Design Elements of Bioretention System	17
2.4 Processes and Mechanisms in Bioretention	24
2.5 Hydraulic and Hydrologic Performance	29

	Page	
2.6	Roles of Infiltration Parameters	34
	2.6.1 Particle Size Distribution (PSD)	35
	2.6.2 Soil Composition	36
	2.6.3 Laboratory and Field Studies	40
	2.6.4 Constant Head Method	46
	2.6.5 Filter Media Depths	48
	2.6.6 Clogging Problems	48
	2.6.7 Soil Compaction	52
2.7	Water Quality Performance	55
	2.7.1 Stormwater Pollutants Characteristics	55
	2.7.2 Treatment Performance in Bioretention System	56
	2.7.3 Interrelationship between Hydrologic Effectiveness and Treatment Performance	64
2.8	Statistical Analysis Approach	66
	2.8.1 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	66
	2.8.2 Regression Analysis	67
2.9	Summary	72

CHAPTER THREE : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Overview of Research Methodology	75
3.2	Preliminary Study	80
	3.2.1 Laboratory Soil Testing	80
	3.2.2 Soil Preparation	85
	3.2.3 Compost Preparation	86
	3.2.4 Permeability Test on Variation of Soil Composition	88
	3.2.5 Small Soil Column Experiment	91

	Page	
3.3	Selection of Sampling Site	98
	3.3.1 Stormwater Characteristics	98
3.4	Soil Column Study	104
	3.4.1 Column Design and Setup	104
	3.4.2 K_{sat} Measurement	110
	3.4.3 Synthetic Stormwater Runoff Preparation	111
	3.4.4 Experimental Operation	112
	3.4.5 Water Quality Analysis	113
3.5	Field Measurement	121
	3.5.1 Field Description	121
	3.5.2 Plant Cultivation and Establishment	125
	3.5.3 Field Measurement of K_{sat}	126
	3.5.4 Actual Stormwater Runoff: Water Quality Monitoring	127
	3.5.5 Synthetic Stormwater Runoff Sampling	128
3.6	Statistical Analysis	132

CHAPTER FOUR : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1	Preliminary Studies	134
	4.1.1 Soil Mixtures Characteristics	134
	4.1.2 Small-Column Study: Evolution of K_{sat}	142
	4.1.3 Small Column Study: TSS, TN and TP removal through different media depths	144
	4.1.4 Comparison of compost products' properties	147
	4.1.5 Soil Properties for Soil Column Studies	149
4.2	Stormwater Pollutant Characteristics	152
4.3	Soil Column Studies	155

	Page
4.3.1 K_{sat} Profiles for Soil Columns	155
4.3.2 Water Quality Responses in Soil Columns	162
4.3.3 Relationship between K_{sat} and Pollutant Removal	191
4.3.4 Review of Laboratory Results for Soil Column Studies	201
4.4 Field Monitoring and Assessment	204
4.4.1 Evaluation on Bioretention Performance : Actual Stormwater Runoff	204
4.4.2 Evaluation on Bioretention Performance:Synthetic Stormwater Runoff	215
4.4.3 Comparison among K_{sat} Measurement Methods	223
4.5 Prediction of K_{sat} using Regression Method	225
4.5.1 Data Prediction based on Soil Column Studies	225
4.5.2 Site Verification	236

CHAPTER FIVE : CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions	241
5.2 Future Recommendations	245
REFERENCES	247

APPENDICES

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	Design guidelines for stormwater management. (Adapted from Fletcher et al.(2014).	13
Table 2.2	Proposed filter media depths across literature.	18
Table 2.3	Recommendation of design criteria of several technical guidelines.	20
Table 2.4	List of possible processes that occurs in bioretention system. (Adapted from Coffman and Siviter (2007))	25
Table 2.5	Performance of rain garden in peak flow reduction from previous studies.	33
Table 2.6	Comparison of K_{sat} for selected soil composition applied in bioretention systems.	39
Table 2.7	Comparison of K_{sat} through soil column and fieldwork studies across literature.	41
Table 2.8	The ranges of stormwater contaminant characteristics across literature.	56
Table 2.9	Previous column studies for stormwater treatment performance.	61
Table 2.10	Other bioretention studies related to treatment performance.	63
Table 2.11	Previous studies on ANOVA application.	68
Table 2.12	Previous studies on regression analysis application.	71
Table 3.1	Engineered soil media composition (refer Table 9.4 in MSMA manual) (DID, 2012)	85
Table 3.2	Nutrient composition in PEATGRO.	87
Table 3.3	Engineered soil compositions.	90
Table 3.4	Several established empirical equations (Odong, 2013).	92
Table 3.5	Design criteria for small column test.	93
Table 3.6	The site characteristics of potential sampling sites.	98

	Page	
Table 3.7	Water quality parameters in selected location along main drain at sampling site.	103
Table 3.8	Soil column configurations for each media characteristics.	108
Table 3.9	The designated inflow rates for soil column studies.	110
Table 3.10	Parameters of Darcy's Law in determining K_{sat} using the constant head method.	111
Table 3.11	Water quality classification	113
Table 3.12	List of standard methods of water quality parameters for each tested soil characteristics.	115
Table 3.13	Bioretention cell configurations.	124
Table 3.14	Estimated mass of each material used in bioretention cells.	125
Table 4.1	Soil properties for selected soil mixtures.	137
Table 4.2	Pearson's correlation between K_{sat} and their related soil parameters for each soil mixtures.	140
Table 4.3	Physical characteristics of compost materials. ($n = 9$ samples with triplicates test).	148
Table 4.4	Soil properties for each soil media characteristics and the treatment conditions.	150
Table 4.5	Soil properties for inflow variation experiment.	151
Table 4.6	Descriptive statistics for stormwater sample's characteristics.	153
Table 4.7	Summary of K_{sat} values for each tested soil column characteristics. Data was presented in the average \pm standard deviation (SD) ($n= 36$ with three replicates for each measurement).	156
Table 4.8	Water quality data for different soil mixtures. Data are displayed in average \pm SD ($n=36$).	163
Table 4.9	Water quality data for different media depths. Data are displayed in average \pm SD ($n=36$).	170
Table 4.10	Water quality data for variety of compost materials. Data are displayed in average \pm SD ($n=36$)	175

	Page	
Table 4.11	Water quality data for variety of mulch layer. Data are displayed in average \pm SD ($n=36$).	182
Table 4.12	Water quality data for inflow variation. Data are displayed in average \pm SD ($n=72$).	188
Table 4.13	Overall performance of each soil configuration. The data are presented in average (SD) with $n= 36$ for each soil configuration and $n= 72$ for inflow variation.	201
Table 4.14	Rainfall characteristics, inflow rates and temperature during actual storm events.	205
Table 4.15	K_{sat} and pollutant concentration for individual storm events for two (2) bioretention cells. Data are presented in average values.	210
Table 4.16	The reduction of soil moisture content.	211
Table 4.17	Two-way ANOVA analysis for both bioretention cells by applying actual stormwater runoff. * indicates the factor which was evaluated for hydrologic/hydraulic parameters and ** indicates the factor for water quality performance.	213
Table 4.18	Pollutant removal data during rainfall events.	214
Table 4.19	Hydraulic and hydrologic properties for synthetic stormwater runoff.	216
Table 4.20	Mean K_{sat} and pollutant concentration for individual synthetic runoff storm event for two (2) bioretention cells. Data are presented in average concentration with $n=54$.	219
Table 4.21	Pollutant removal data for synthetic stormwater runoff.	222
Table 4.22	SLR equations of the relationship between $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ and BOD_5 treatment performance and K_{rel} for soil mixtures condition.	227
Table 4.23	SLR and MLR equations for soil media depths condition.	228
Table 4.24	SLR and MLR equations for compost material condition.	230
Table 4.25	SLR for mulch layer tested condition.	234
Table 4.26	SLR and MLR equations for inflow variation condition.	235
Table 4.27	List of regression models to be used for site verification.	237

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	The hydrological cycle (a) natural environment (Adapted from Trenbeth and Asrar, 2012) (b) urban areas (Adapted from Marsalek et al., 2006)	11
Figure 2.2	Different types of bioretention applications (a) individual lot of housing area in Minnesota, USA (b) centralized rain garden at residential areas, Pennsylvania (c) parking lot at Bradford beach, Madison, USA (d) road side in Ballard, Seattle	15
Figure 2.3	The nitrogen cycle associated with treatment mechanisms. (Adapted from Collins et al.(2010))	27
Figure 2.4	The hydrologic process in bioretention system. (Adapted from Akan(2013))	35
Figure 2.5	The evolution of K_{sat} over time which influenced by (a) vegetation (b) sizing of biofilters. (Adopted from Le Coustumer et al.(2012))	45
Figure 2.6	Deep and shallow infiltration method for K_{sat} measurement for field bioretention. (Adopted from Le Coustumer et al.(2009))	47
Figure 2.7	Reduction of K_{sat} due to clogging and reduction of fecal bacteria. (Adapted from Bright et al.(2010))	50
Figure 2.8	The trends of K_{sat} for both (a) physical clogging. (b) bioclogging. (Adapted from Reddi et al.(2005); Zhong and Wu (2013)	51
Figure 2.9	The trends of TN removals versus measured K_{sat} . (Adapted from Le Coustumer et al. (2009))	65
Figure 3.1	The goals of research work.	75
Figure 3.2	Overall flow chart of research work.	76
Figure 3.3	Pycnometer test	81
Figure 3.4	The sieve analysis equipments. (a) Dry sieve shaker (b) Hydrometer analysis.	82
Figure 3.5	Soil compaction test. (a) Proctor hammer with 27 blows. (b) Weighted dried soil samples.	83

	Page
Figure 3.6	Dry bulk density using tapped method test. (a) The digital balance (b) Weighted dried soil samples. 84
Figure 3.7	Standard permeability test. (a) Constant head test (b) Falling head test. 90
Figure 3.8	Small-columns setup (a) Soil mixtures with different types of sand (b) Mechanical mixer 93
Figure 3.9	Schematic diagram of column setup. 94
Figure 3.10	Small column setup for variation media depths 95
Figure 3.11	The proposed sites using satellite imagery. Source: www.google.com . 100
Figure 3.12	Source identification at six (6) locations, including Site B are using satellite images. 101
Figure 3.13	Soil columns setup. 106
Figure 3.14	Schematic Diagram for Soil Column Study. 107
Figure 3.15	TSS filtering instrument (a) TSS vacuum filter (b) Digital balance 116
Figure 3.16	DO benchtop 117
Figure 3.17	Lab instrumentations (a) DRB 200 reactor (b) DR 3900 Spectrophotometer. 118
Figure 3.18	YSI PROFESSIONAL Plus Multiparameter Instrument 120
Figure 3.19	Satellite image on site location in USM Engineering Campus. 122
Figure 3.20	Bioretention cell during rainfall condition (a) Cell 1 (b) Cell 2. 123
Figure 3.21	Plant establishment in Cell 2. 126
Figure 3.22	Deep infiltration method for (a) Cell 1 (b) Cell 2. (Adapted by Le Coustumer et al. (2007)) 127
Figure 3.23	Actual stormwater sampling work during nine (9) storm events. 128
Figure 3.24	Synthetic stormwater runoff in 1m ³ containers. 129

	Page
Figure 3.25	Sediment layer was developed on top of soil media in vertical pipes. 130
Figure 3.26	KSAT instrumentation. 131
Figure 4.1	S-curves for each soil mixture. (a) Sand and topsoil (silt loam) (b) mixtures of sand-topsoil. 135
Figure 4.2	The relationship density and compaction. 138
Figure 4.3	Variation of K_{sat} (mm/hr) values for (a) Sand (b) Topsoil 138
Figure 4.4	Variation of K_{sat} (mm/hr) values for mixture of (a) Sand/topsoil (b) Sand/topsoil/compost. 139
Figure 4.5	Relationship between measured K_{sat} and computed K_{sat} based on established empirical equations. (a) Hazen approximation (b) Kozeny-Carman equation (c) Breyer equation (d) Slitcher equation 141
Figure 4.6	Relationship between K_{sat} and pore volume. 142
Figure 4.7	K_{sat} trends for more than 2 months monitoring. 143
Figure 4.8	Evolution of K_{sat} through different media depths. 144
Figure 4.9	Boxplot diagrams of TSS concentrations and its treatment performance. 145
Figure 4.10	Boxplot diagrams of TP concentrations and its treatment performance. 146
Figure 4.11	Boxplot diagrams of TN concentrations and its treatment performance. 147
Figure 4.12	Nutrient contaminant concentrations in different types compost materials (a) TN concentration (b) TP concentration (c) $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ concentration. 149
Figure 4.13	K_{sat} profiles for different soil mixtures. 157
Figure 4.14	K_{sat} profiles for different media depths. 158
Figure 4.15	K_{sat} profiles for different types of compost materials. 159
Figure 4.16	K_{sat} profiles for different mulch layer. 160
Figure 4.17	K_{sat} profiles for different design of inflow rates. 161

	Page
Figure 4.18 Relationship between K_{sat} and treated depth.	162
Figure 4.19 $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ treatment performance over time for soil mixtures treatment conditions.	164
Figure 4.20 BOD_5 treatment performance over time for soil mixtures treatment conditions.	166
Figure 4.21 TSS treatment performance over time for soil mixtures treatment conditions.	167
Figure 4.22 TP treatment performance over time for soil mixtures treatment conditions.	169
Figure 4.23 BOD_5 treatment performances over time for media depth treatment conditions.	171
Figure 4.24 COD treatment performances over time for media depth treatment conditions.	172
Figure 4.25 TSS treatment performances over time for media depth treatment conditions.	173
Figure 4.26 TP treatment performances over time for media depth treatment conditions.	174
Figure 4.27 $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ treatment performance by having different compost materials over time.	177
Figure 4.28 BOD_5 treatment performance by having different compost materials over time.	178
Figure 4.29 TSS treatment performance by having different compost materials over time.	180
Figure 4.30 TP treatment performance by having different compost materials over time.	181
Figure 4.31 TSS treatment performance by presence of mulch layer over time.	185
Figure 4.32 TP treatment performance by presence of mulch layer over time.	186
Figure 4.33 The profiles of $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ treatment efficiency along the measurement period.	189

	Page
Figure 4.34 Relationship .between NH ₃ -N removal and K_{sat} for different soil mixtures.	192
Figure 4.35 Relationship .between BOD ₅ removal and K_{sat} for different soil mixtures.	193
Figure 4.36 Relationship .between TSS removal and K_{sat} for different soil mixtures.	193
Figure 4.37 Relationship .between TP removal and K_{sat} for different soil mixtures..	194
Figure 4.38 COD reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different soil depths.	195
Figure 4.39 TSS reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different soil depths.	195
Figure 4.40 TP reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different soil depths.	196
Figure 4.41 Evolution of NH ₃ -N reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different compost materials.	197
Figure 4.42 Evolution of TSS reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different compost materials.	197
Figure 4.43 Evolution of TP reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different compost materials.	198
Figure 4.44 Evolution of TSS pollutant reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different types of mulch layer.	199
Figure 4.45 Evolution of TP pollutant reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different types of mulch layer.	199
Figure 4.46 Evolution of NH ₃ -N reduction versus measured K_{sat} for different types of inflow variation.	200
Figure 4.47 Rainfall data from July 2015 until February 2016	205
Figure 4.48 Condition of inlet and outlet during storm event.(a) Outflow from non-vegetated cell (Cell 1) (b) Outflow from vegetated cell (Cell 2)	206
Figure 4.49 The inflow and outflow hydrographs for both cells..	207

	Page	
Figure 4.50	Ponding occurred in bioretention cells during rainy season. (a) Ponding condition in Cell 1 (b) Ponding condition in Cell 2	207
Figure 4.51	Profile of mean K_{sat} Cell 1 and Cell 2. The storm events are displayed as event dates.	208
Figure 4.52	The cracks condition occurred in the cell during dry periods.	209
Figure 4.53	Ponding condition during the application of synthetic stormwater runoff.	216
Figure 4.54	The hydrograph of inflow and outflow of bioretention cells.	216
Figure 4.55	The evolution of K_{sat} for both bioretention cells.	217
Figure 4.56	Water purification through bioretention cells.	220
Figure 4.57	K_{sat} values by using different techniques of measurement.(a) Cell 1 (b) Cell 2	224
Figure 4.58	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for soil mixtures treatment conditions.	226
Figure 4.59	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for different media depths. Interaction with (a) one parameter (b) Two parameters (c) Three parameters	228
Figure 4.60	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for variation compost materials using SLR equations.	231
Figure 4.61	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for variation compost materials using SLR equations. Plotted data for (a) Two parameters (b) Three parameters	232
Figure 4.62	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for mulch layer conditions.	233
Figure 4.63	Relationship between predicted K_{rel} and measured K_{rel} for inflow variation. (a) Interaction between K_{rel} and $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ treatment performance (b) Response pH and DO on K_{rel} (c) Interaction of K_{rel} based on dual parameters	235

	Page
Figure 4.64 The predicted K_{rel} versus observed K_{rel} tested for actual stormwater runoff in field condition based on the strongest relationship between parameters (a) Equation 4.3 (b) Equation 4.6 (c) Equation 4.9 (d) Equation 4.17 (e) Equation 4.27 (f) Equation 4.32	237
Figure 4.65 The predicted K_{rel} versus observed K_{rel} tested for actual stormwater runoff in field condition based on the strongest relationship between parameters (c) Equation 4.9 (d) Equation 4.17 (e) Equation 4.27 (f) Equation 4.32 parameters (g) Equation 4.34 (h) Equation 4.36	239

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	Contributing Drainage Area
A_c	Surface area of column
BD	Bulk density (g/cm^3)
C_c	Coefficient of Curvature
C_f	Target TSS concentration (mg/L)
C_{ini}	TSS concentration of raw stormwater runoff before dilution (mg/L)
C_u	Coefficient of Uniformity
C_v	Runoff Coefficient
D	Diameter of column
D_{10}	Grain size at 10% finer
D_{30}	Grain size at 30% finer
D_{50}	Grain size at 50% finer
D_{60}	Grain size at 60% finer
D_r	Relative density
G_s	Specific gravity
K_e	Total K_{sat}
K_{eff}	K_{sat} during the application of synthetic stormwater runoff
K_{ini}	K_{sat} during the application of clean water (tap water)
K_{rel}	Ration of K_{eff} over K_{ini}
K_{sat}	Saturated hydraulic conductivity (mm/hr)
L	Length of soil (m)
L_T	Total length of soil media
m	mass of soil material

n	a number of samples
P	Ponding depth (m)
P_D	Rainfall depth (mm)
Q	Outflow rates
R^2	Coefficient of Determination
V	Volume of soil materials
V_f	Working volume
V_{ini}	The volume required for dilution

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
APHA	American Public Health Association
ARI	Annual Recurrence Interval
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BOD ₅	Five-day Biochemical Oxygen Demand (mg/L)
BOD _r	BOD removal
BSI	British Standard Institution
C	Compost
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand (mg/L)
COD _r	COD removal
CS	Coarse Sand
Cu	Cuprum
CVF	Compost Fraction Volume
DID	Department of Irrigation and Drainage
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
DOE	Department of Environment
ESP	Exchangeable Sodium Percentage
ET	Evapotranspiration
FAWB	Facility of Advanced Water Biofiltration
FS	Fine sand
GLM	General Linear Model

HRT	Hydraulic retention time
IWS	Internal Water Storage
LID	Low Impact Development
MLR	Multiple Regression Method
MS	Medium sand
MSMA	Manual Saliran Mesra Alam Malaysia
N	Nitrogen
NH ₃	Ammonia
NH ₃ -N	Ammoniacal nitrogen
NH ₃ -N _r	NH ₃ -N removal
NH ₄ ⁺	Ammonium
NO ₂ ⁻	Nitrate
NO ₃ ⁻	Nitrite
NO _x	Nitrogen gas
P	Phosphorus
Pb	Plumbum
PSD	Particle Size Distribution
REDAC	River Engineering and Urban Drainage Research Centre
PTF	Pedotransfer
RMSE	Root Mean Square Error
SAR	Sodium Absorption Ratio (SAR)
SCMs	Stormwater Control Measures
SD	Standard Deviation
SLR	Single Linear Regression
SUDs	Sustainable Urban Drainage system

TCOD	Total Chemical Oxygen Demand
TN	Total Nitrogen
TN _r	TN removal
TP	Total Phosphorus
TP _r	TP removal
TS	Topsoil
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
TSS _r	TSS removal
USCS	Unified Soil Classification System
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WQI	Water Quality Index
WQ _v	Water Quality Volume (m ³)
WSUD	Water Sensitive Urban Drainage
Zn	Zinc

**KAJIAN KEBERALIRAN HIDRAULIK MEDIA TANAH KEJURUTERAAN
BAGI OLAHAN AIR LARIAN AIR RIBUT DI DALAM KEMUDAHAN
BIOPENYIMPANAN**

ABSTRAK

Kaedah konvensional sistem perparitan seolah-olah tidak mencukupi untuk memenuhi air larian permukaan bandar akibat peningkatan populasi bandar yang mendadak. Ia adalah terhad kepada pendekatan struktur yang berkaitan dengan pengaruh hidraulik dan hidrologi. Oleh itu, pendekatan ini telah beralih kepada pendekatan yang lebih holistik dengan mengambil kira keperluan alam sekitar. Pindaan garis panduan Manual Saliran Mesra Alam Malaysia (MSMA) pada tahun 2012 telah diperkenalkan pada bersesuaian dengan amalan semasa untuk menangani isu-isu air ribut bandar dan sub-bandar. Biopenyimpanan adalah amalan yang digalakkan yang menerapkan proses semula jadi, mengintegrasikan pengetahuan sains dan kejuruteraan hidrologi, hidraulik dan alam sekitar ke dalam satu sistem. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidik interaksi antara parameter hidraulik tanah terutamanya keberaliran hidraulik tepu (K_{sat}) dan prestasi olahan kualiti air dan penentuan K_{sat} sebagai penanda aras berdasarkan prestasi biopenyimpanan. Set data komprehensif yang diperlukan untuk kajian ini telah diperolehi daripada beberapa siri ujian makmal standard, kajian kolum yang direkabentuk dan penyiasatan lapangan. Bagi tujuan ini, tiga (3) kolum tanah telah dibina di Makmal Permodelan Fizikal, Pusat Penyelidikan Kejuruteraan Sungai dan Saliran Bandar (REDAC), USM. Empat (4) konfigurasi tanah dan satu (1) parameter hidrologi telah diuji untuk kajian ruang tanah: campuran tanah kejuruteraan, kedalaman media, bahan-bahan kompos, lapisan sungkupan dan variasi aliran masuk.