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Pollutant Concentrations in Influent and Effluent at the El Cerrito Rain Garden.

- **Suspended Sediment Concentration (mg/L)**
- **Sum of PCBs (ng/L)**
- **Total Copper (µg/L)**
- **Total Mercury (ng/L)**
- **Dissolved Mercury (ng/L)**
- **Total Methylmercury (ng/L)**
- **Microplastics (particles/100 L)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>SSC (mg/L)</th>
<th>PCBs (ng/L)</th>
<th>TOC (mg/L)</th>
<th>HgD (ng/L)</th>
<th>HgT (ng/L)</th>
<th>MeHg (ng/L)</th>
<th>CuD (ug/L)</th>
<th>CuT (ug/L)</th>
<th>Pb (ug/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Cerrito Bioretention Facility</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFOBB Toll Plaza - 5/5</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oakland Tree Well 2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oakland Tree Well 6</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransten Facility No. 7</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City Public Library</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Tree Well Subsurface</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-161%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Tree Well Surface</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-284%</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond 1st &amp; Cutting Cell 3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-276%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond 1st &amp; Cutting Cell 4</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>-449%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 17. Performance as a function of influent concentrations.
Underdrain Flow
Figure 14: Concentrations of PCBs associated with smaller particles (<10 μm) and larger particles (≥10 μm) before and after treatment.
Figure 18: Concentrations of mercury on particles <10 μm and larger than ≥10 μm, both in the influent and effluent where measured.
Figure 28. Estimation of mass (mg) of contaminants by depth throughout the entire rain garden (including both the inlets and the main bioretention unit by area).
Some results & hypotheses from the data

- Results for Hg capture range from a 67% reduction in mean concentrations to a 48% increase
- 23-69% reduction for MeHg (excepting outlier)
- No reduction of HgD
- Hg on smaller particles and less likely to filter out
- When Hg is reduced it is likely filtering out near the surface
Design Considerations

• Design to your target pollutants
• Prevent overflow/bypass of most Hg polluted runoff
• Depth
• Irrigation
• Underdrain recommended; submerged zone not recommended
We have a lot to learn!

Optimal layouts and media design

Trade-offs between pore size and volume infiltrated

Depth: how much more removal do you get with increasing media depth?

Irrigation: Will it really help and at what cost?

Can organic and pH amendments improve adsorption significantly?

Vegetation: How much Hg can be taken up via rhizostimulation and are there certain (GI-worthy) plants that are better than others?
Thank you!
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