

VERIFICATION STATEMENT

GLOBE Performance Solutions

Verifies the performance of

Jellyfish[®] Filter JF4-2-1

Developed by Imbrium Systems, Inc.,
Whitby, Ontario, Canada

In accordance with

ISO 14034:2016

**Environmental management —
Environmental technology verification (ETV)**



John D. Wiebe, PhD
Executive Chairman
GLOBE Performance Solutions



August 3, 2017
Vancouver, BC, Canada

Verification Body
GLOBE Performance Solutions
404 – 999 Canada Place | Vancouver, B.C | Canada |V6C 3E2

Technology description and application

The Jellyfish® Filter is an engineered stormwater quality treatment technology designed to remove a variety of stormwater pollutants including floatable trash and debris, oil, coarse and fine suspended sediments, and particulate-bound pollutants such as nutrients, heavy metals, and hydrocarbons. The Jellyfish Filter combines gravitational pre-treatment (sedimentation and floatation) and membrane filtration in a single compact structure. The system utilizes membrane filtration cartridges comprised of multiple pleated filter elements (“filtration tentacles”) that provide high filtration surface area with the associated advantages of high flow rate, high sediment capacity, and low filtration flux rate.




Figure 1. Cut-away graphic of a Jellyfish® Filter manhole with 6 hi-flo cartridges and 1 draindown cartridge

Figure 1 depicts a cut-away graphic of a typical 6-ft diameter Jellyfish® Filter manhole with 6 hi-flo cartridges and 1 draindown cartridge (JF6-6-1). Stormwater influent enters the system through the inlet pipe and builds a pond behind the maintenance access wall, with the pond elevation providing driving head. Flow is channeled downward into the lower chamber beneath the cartridge deck. A flexible separator skirt (not shown in the graphic) surrounds the filtration zone where the filtration tentacles of each cartridge are suspended, and the volume between the vessel wall and the outside surface of the separator skirt comprises a pretreatment channel. As flow spreads throughout the pretreatment channel, floatable pollutants accumulate at the surface of the pond behind the maintenance access wall and also beneath the cartridge deck in the pretreatment channel, while coarse sediments settle to the sump. Flow proceeds under the separator skirt and upward into the filtration zone, entering each filtration tentacle and depositing fine suspended sediment and associated particulate-bound pollutants on the outside surface of the membranes. Filtered water proceeds up the center tube of each tentacle, with the flow from each tentacle combining under the cartridge lid, and discharging to the top of the

cartridge deck through the cartridge lid orifice. Filtered effluent from the hi-flo cartridges enters a pool enclosed by a 15-cm high weir, and if storm intensity and resultant driving head is sufficient, filtered water overflows the weir and proceeds across the cartridge deck to the outlet pipe. Filtered effluent discharging from the draindown cartridge(s) passes directly to the outlet pipe, and requires only a minimal amount of driving head (2.5 cm) to provide forward flow. As storm intensity subsides and driving head drops below 15 cm, filtered water within the backwash pool reverses direction and passes backward through the hi-flo cartridges, and thereby dislodges sediment from the membranes which subsequently settles to the sump below the filtration zone. During this passive backwashing process, water in the lower chamber is displaced only through the draindown cartridge(s). Additional self-cleaning processes include gravity, as well as vibrational pulses emitted when flow exits the orifice of each cartridge lid, and these combined processes significantly extend the cartridge service life and maintenance cleaning interval. Sediment removal from the sump by vacuum is required when sediment depths reach 30 cm, and cartridges are typically removed, externally rinsed, and recommissioned on an annual basis, or as site-specific maintenance conditions require. Filtration tentacle replacement is typically required every 3 – 5 years.

Performance conditions

The data and results published in this Technology Fact Sheet were obtained from a field monitoring program conducted on a Jellyfish® Filter JF4-2-1 (4-ft diameter manhole with 2 hi-flo cartridges and 1 draindown cartridge), in accordance with the provisions of the TARP Tier II Protocol (TARP, 2003) and New Jersey Tier II Stormwater Test Requirements—Amendments to TARP Tier II Protocol (NJDEP, 2009). Testing was completed by researchers led by Dr. John Sansalone at the University of Florida’s Engineering School of Sustainable Infrastructure and Environment. The drainage area providing stormwater runoff to the test unit varied between 502 m² and 799 m² (5400 ft² to 8600 ft²) depending on storm intensity and wind direction. The unit was monitored for a total of 25 TARP qualifying storm events (i.e. ≥ 2.5 mm of rainfall) contributing cumulative rainfall of 381 mm (15 in) over the 13-month period between May 28, 2010 and June 27, 2011. Only TARP-qualified storms were routed through the unit, and maintenance was not required during the testing period based on sediment accumulation less than the depth indicated for maintenance, and also based on hydraulic testing performed on the system after the conclusion of monitoring.

Table 1 shows the specified and achieved amended TARP criteria for storm selection and sampling. **Table 2** shows the observed ranges of operational conditions that occurred over the testing period.

Table 1. Specified and achieved amended TARP criteria for storm selection and sampling

Description	Criteria value	Achieved value
Total rainfall	≥ 2.5 mm (0.1 in)	> 2.5 mm (0.1 in)
Minimum inter-event period	6 hrs	10 hrs
Minimum flow-weighted composite sample storm coverage	70% including as much of the first 20% of the storm	100%
Minimum influent/effluent samples	10, but a minimum of 5 subsamples for composite samples	Minimum of 8 subsamples for composite samples
Total sampled rainfall	Minimum 381 mm (15 in)	384 mm (15.01 in)
Number of storms	Minimum 20	25

Table 2. Observed operational conditions for events monitored over the study period

Operational condition	Observed range
Storm durations	26 – 691 min
Previous dry hours	10 - 910 hrs
Rainfall depth	3 – 50 mm
Initial rainfall to runoff lag time	1 – 34 min
Runoff volume	206 – 13,229 L
Peak rainfall intensity	5 – 137 mm/hr
Peak runoff flow rate	0.5 – 14.3 L/s
Event median flow rate	0.01 – 5.5 L/s

The 4-ft diameter test unit has sedimentation surface area of 1.17 m² (12.56 ft²). Each of the three filter cartridges employed in the test unit uses filtration tentacles of 137 cm (54 in) length, with filter surface area of 35.4 m² (381 ft²) per cartridge, and total filter surface area of 106.2 m² (1143 ft²) for the three cartridges combined. The design treatment flow rate is 5 L/s (80 gal/min) for each of the two hi-flo cartridges and 2.5 L/s (40 gal/min) for the single draindown cartridge, for a total design treatment flow rate of 12.6 L/s (200 gal/min) at design driving head of 457 mm (18 in). This translates to a filtration flux rate (flow rate per unit filter surface area) of 0.14 L/s/m² (0.21 gal/min/ft²) for each hi-flo cartridge and 0.07 L/s/m² (0.11 gal/min/ft²) for the draindown cartridge. The design flow rate for each cartridge is controlled by the sizing of the orifice in the cartridge lid. The distance from the bottom of the filtration tentacles to the sump is 61 cm (24 in).

Performance claims

The Jellyfish® Filter demonstrated the removal efficiencies indicated in **Table 3** for respective constituents during field monitoring of 25 TARP qualified storm events with cumulative rainfall of 381 mm, conducted in accordance with the provisions of the TARP Tier II Protocol (TARP, 2003) and New Jersey Tier II Stormwater Test Requirements—Amendments to TARP Tier II Protocol (NJDEP, 2009), and using the following design parameters:

- System hydraulic loading rate (system treatment flow rate per unit of sedimentation surface area) of 10.8 L/s/m² (15.9 gal/min/ft²) or lower
- Filtration flux rate (flow rate per unit filter surface area) of 0.14 L/s/m² (0.21 gal/min/ft²) or lower for each hi-flo cartridge and 0.07 L/s/m² (0.11 gal/min/ft²) or lower for each draindown cartridge
- Distance from the bottom of the filtration tentacles to the sump of 61 cm (24 in) or greater
- Driving head of 457 mm (18 in) or greater

Table 3. Mean, median and 95% confidence interval (median) for removal efficiencies of selected stormwater constituents

Parameter	Mean	Median	Median - 95% Lower Limit	Median - 95% Upper Limit
TSS	84.7	85.6	82.8	89.8
SSC	97.5	98.3	97.1	98.7
Total phosphorus	48.8	49.1	43.3	60.1
Total nitrogen	37.9	39.3	31.2	54.6
Zinc	55.3	69	39	75
Copper	83.0	91.7	75.1	98.9
Oil and grease	60.1	60	42.7	100

N.B. As with any field test of stormwater treatment devices, removal efficiencies will vary based on pollutant influent concentrations and other site specific conditions.

Performance results

The frequency of rainfall depths monitored during the study is presented in **Figure 2**. The median and 90th percentile rainfall depths were 11 mm and 31.7 mm, respectively. These values represent the depth of rainfall that is not exceeded in 50 and 90 percent of the monitored rainfall events.




Figure 2. Rainfall depth frequency curve

Sediment removal performance was assessed by measuring the event mean concentration and mass of suspended sediment entering and leaving the unit during runoff events. This involved sampling the full cross-section of influent and effluent flows manually at 2 - 10 minute intervals for the full duration of each storm event and combining discrete samples into flow-weighted composites. Comparing the theoretical mass recovery from the sump calculated by the difference between the influent and effluent mass to the actual dry weight of the recovered sump mass showed an overall mass balance recovery of 94.5% over the study period.

The median d50 particle size (i.e. 50th percentile particle size) of the influent and effluent was 82 and 3 μm , respectively (**Figure 3**). The median influent particles sizes ranged between 22 and 263 μm , whereas median effluent particle sizes ranged between 1 and 11 μm .




Figure 3. The rainfall depth and d10, d50, and d90 particle sizes of the influent and effluent composite samples for each monitored storm event over the 13-month testing period

Sampling of flows into and out of the Jellyfish Filter over the testing period showed statistically significant reductions ($p < 0.05$; Wilcoxon signed-rank test) in influent event mean concentrations for all selected stormwater constituents (Table 4 and Figure 4). Effluent event mean Suspended Sediment Concentrations (SSC) were below 19 mg/L during all monitored events. Load-based removal rates were also calculated based on the sum of loads over the study period. These removal rates ranged from 46.3 for Total Nitrogen to 98.6 for SSC (Table 4).

Table 4. Summary statistics for influent and effluent event mean concentrations for selected constituents

Water Quality Variable	Sampling Location	Min	Max	Median	Range	Mean	SD	Load based removal efficiency (%)
TSS	Influent (mg/L)	16.30	261.00	79.30	244.70	86.26	51.37	87.2
	Effluent (mg/L)	3.20	21.70	11.80	18.50	10.99	4.79	
SSC	Influent (mg/L)	78.20	1401.70	444.50	1323.50	482.26	338.34	98.6
	Effluent (mg/L)	2.80	18.10	7.30	15.30	7.88	3.77	
TP	Influent (µg/L)	887.00	8793.00	3063.00	7906.00	3550.20	1914.50	64.2
	Effluent (µg/L)	472.00	4769.00	1480.00	4297.00	1688.08	1059.98	
TN	Influent (µg/L)	1170.00	10479.00	3110.00	9309.00	3519.32	2161.47	46.3
	Effluent (µg/L)	553.00	6579.00	1610.00	6026.00	2091.76	1613.61	
Zn	Influent (µg/L)	0.005	7600.00	1500.00	7600.00	1792.00	1852.91	76.1
	Effluent (µg/L)	0.005	2760.00	450.00	2760.00	561.64	594.70	
Cu	Influent (µg/L)	0.001	880.40	79.50	880.40	171.28	229.33	92.1
	Effluent (µg/L)	0.001	51.30	6.90	51.30	14.36	17.22	
Oil and Grease	Influent (mg/L)	0.20	4.06	0.93	3.86	1.07	0.82	46.4
	Effluent (mg/L)	0.00	2.32	0.35	2.32	0.50	0.60	




Figure 4. Boxplots showing the distribution of influent and effluent event mean concentrations (EMC) for selected stormwater constituents over the study period

Verification

The verification was completed by the Verification Expert, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, contracted by GLOBE Performance Solutions, using the International Standard **ISO 14034:2016 Environmental management – Environmental technology verification (ETV)**. Data and information provided by Imbrium Systems to support the performance claim included the performance monitoring report prepared by University of Florida, Engineering School of Sustainable Infrastructure and Environment, and dated November 2011. This report is based on testing completed in accordance with the Technology Acceptance Reciprocity Partnership (TARP) Tier II Protocol (2003) and New Jersey Tier II Stormwater Test Requirements--Amendments to TARP Tier II Protocol (NJDEP, 2009).

What is ISO 14034:2016 Environmental management – Environmental technology verification (ETV)?

ISO 14034:2016 specifies principles, procedures and requirements for environmental technology verification (ETV), and was developed and published by the *International Organization for Standardization (ISO)*. The objective of ETV is to provide credible, reliable and independent verification of the performance of environmental technologies. An environmental technology is a technology that either results in an environmental added value or measures parameters that indicate an environmental impact. Such technologies have an increasingly important role in addressing environmental challenges and achieving sustainable development.

For more information on the Jellyfish® Filter please contact:

Imbrium Systems, Inc.
407 Fairview Drive
Whitby, ON
L1N 3A9, Canada
Tel: 416-960-9900
info@imbriumsystems.com

For more information on ISO 14034:2016 / ETV please contact:

GLOBE Performance Solutions
World Trade Centre
404 – 999 Canada Place
Vancouver, BC
V6C 3E2 Canada
Tel: 604-695-5018 / Toll Free: 1-855-695-5018
etv@globperformance.com

Limitation of verification

GLOBE Performance Solutions and the Verification Expert provide the verification services solely on the basis of the information supplied by the applicant or vendor and assume no liability thereafter. The responsibility for the information supplied remains solely with the applicant or vendor and the liability for the purchase, installation, and operation (whether consequential or otherwise) is not transferred to any other party as a result of the verification.