

VERIFICATION STATEMENT

GLOBE Performance Solutions

Verifies the performance of

Stormceptor® EF and EFO Oil-Grit Separators

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

Registration: GPS-ETV_VR2023-11-15_Imbrium-SC

In accordance with

ISO 14034:2016

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



John D. Wiebe, PhD
Executive Chairman
GLOBE Performance Solutions

November 15, 2023
Vancouver, BC, Canada



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

Technology description and application

The Stormceptor® EF and EFO are treatment devices designed to remove oil, sediment, trash, debris, and pollutants attached to particulates from Stormwater and snowmelt runoff. The device takes the place of a conventional manhole within a storm drain system and offers design flexibility that works with various site constraints. The EFO is designed with a shorter bypass weir height, which accepts lower surface loading rate into the sump, thereby reducing re-entrainment of captured free floating light liquids.




Figure 1. Graphic of typical inline Stormceptor® unit and core components.

Stormwater and snowmelt runoff enters the Stormceptor® EF/EFO's upper chamber through the inlet pipe(s) or a surface inlet grate. An insert divides the unit into lower and upper chambers and incorporates a weir to reduce influent velocity and separate influent (untreated) from effluent (treated) flows. Influent water ponds upstream of the insert's weir providing driving head for the water flowing downwards into the drop pipe where a vortex pulls the water into the lower chamber. The water diffuses at lower velocities in multiple directions through the drop pipe outlet openings. Oil and other floatables rise up and are trapped beneath the insert, while sediments undergo gravitational settling to the sump's bottom. Water from the sump can exit by flowing upward to the outlet riser onto the top side of the insert and downstream of the weir, where it discharges through the outlet pipe.

Maximum flow rate into the lower chamber is a function of weir height and drop pipe orifice diameter. The Stormceptor® EF and EFO are designed to allow a surface loading rate of 1135 L/min/m² (27.9 gal/min/ft²) and 535 L/min/m² (13.1 gal/min/ft²) into the lower chamber, respectively. When prescribed surface loading rates are exceeded, ponding water can overtop the weir height and bypass the lower treatment chamber, exiting directly through the outlet pipe. Hydraulic testing and scour testing demonstrate that the internal bypass effectively prevents scour at all bypass flow rates. Increasing the bypass flow rate does not increase the orifice-controlled flow rate into the lower treatment chamber where sediment is stored. This internal bypass feature allows for in-line installation, avoiding the cost of

additional bypass structures. During bypass, treatment continues in the lower chamber at the maximum flow rate. The Stormceptor® EFO's lower design surface loading rate is favorable for minimizing re-entrainment and washout of captured light liquids. Inspection of Stormceptor® EF and EFO devices is performed from grade by inserting a sediment probe through the outlet riser and an oil dipstick through the oil inspection pipe. The unit can be maintained by using a vacuum hose through the outlet riser.

Performance conditions

The data and results published in this Technology Fact Sheet were obtained from the testing program conducted on the Imbrium Systems Inc.'s Stormceptor® EF4 and EFO4 Oil-Grit Separators, in accordance with the Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil-Grit Separators (Version 3.0, June 2014). The Procedure was prepared by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) for Environment Canada's Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program. A copy of the Procedure may be accessed on the Canadian ETV website at www.etvcanada.ca.

Performance claim(s)

Capture test^a:

During the capture test, the Stormceptor® EF4 OGS device, with a false floor set to 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth and a constant influent test sediment concentration of 200 mg/L, removes 70, 64, 54, 48, 46, 44, and 49 percent of influent sediment by mass at surface loading rates of 40, 80, 200, 400, 600, 1000, and 1400 L/min/m², respectively.

Stormceptor® EFO4, with a false floor set to 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth and a constant influent test sediment concentration of 200 mg/L, removes 70, 64, 54, 48, 42, 40, and 34 percent of influent sediment by mass at surface loading rates of 40, 80, 200, 400, 600, 1000, and 1400 L/min/m², respectively.

Scour test^a:

During the scour test, the Stormceptor® EF4 and Stormceptor® EFO4 OGS devices, with 10.2 cm (4 inches) of test sediment pre-loaded onto a false floor reaching 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth, generate corrected effluent concentrations of 4.6, 0.7, 0, 0.2, and 0.4 mg/L at 5-minute duration surface loading rates of 200, 800, 1400, 2000, and 2600 L/min/m², respectively.

Light liquid re-entrainment test^a:

During the light liquid re-entrainment test, the Stormceptor® EFO4 OGS device with surrogate low-density polyethylene beads preloaded within the lower chamber oil collection zone, representing a floating light liquid volume equal to a depth of 50.8 mm over the sedimentation area, retained 100, 99.5, 99.8, 99.8, and 99.9 percent of loaded beads by mass during the 5-minute duration surface loading rates of 200, 800, 1400, 2000, and 2600 L/min/m².

^a The claim can be applied to other units smaller or larger than the tested unit as long as the untested units meet the scaling rule specified in the Procedure for Laboratory of Testing of Oil Grit Separators (Version 3.0, June 2014)

Performance results

The test sediment consisted of ground silica (1 – 1000 micron) with a specific gravity of 2.65, uniformly mixed to meet the particle size distribution specified in the testing procedure. The *Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil Grit Separators* requires that the three sample average of the test sediment particle size distribution (PSD) meet the specified PSD percent less than values within a boundary threshold of 6%. The comparison of the average test sediment PSD to the CETV specified PSD in Figure 2 indicates that the test sediment used for the capture and scour tests met this condition.




Figure 2. The three sample average particle size distribution (PSD) of the test sediment used for the capture and scour test compared to the specified PSD.

The capacity of the device to retain sediment was determined at seven surface loading rates using the modified mass balance method. This method involved measuring the mass and particle size distribution of the injected and retained sediment for each test run. Performance was evaluated with a false floor simulating the technology filled to 50% of the manufacturer's recommended maximum sediment storage depth. The test was carried out with clean water that maintained a sediment concentration below 20 mg/L. Based on these conditions, removal efficiencies for individual particle size classes and for the test sediment as a whole were determined for each of the tested surface loading rates (Table 1). Since the EF and EFO models are identical except for the weir height, which bypasses flows from the EFO model at a surface loading rate of 535 L/min/m² (13.1 gpm/ft²), sediment capture tests at surface loading rates from 40 to 400 L/min/m² were only performed on the EF unit. Surface loading rates of 600, 1000, and 1400 L/min/m² were tested on both units separately. Results for the EFO model at these higher flow rates are presented in Table 2.

In some instances, the removal efficiencies were above 100% for certain particle size fractions. These discrepancies are not unique to any one test laboratory and may be attributed to errors relating to the blending of sediment, collection of representative samples for laboratory submission, and laboratory

analysis of PSD. Due to these errors, caution should be exercised in applying the removal efficiencies by particle size fraction for the purposes of sizing the tested device (see [Bulletin # CETV 2016-11-0001](#)). The results for “all particle sizes by mass balance” (see Table 1 and 2) are based on measurements of the total injected and retained sediment mass, and are therefore not subject to blending, sampling or PSD analysis errors.

Table 1. Removal efficiencies (%) of the EF4 at specified surface loading rates

Particle size fraction (µm)	Surface loading rate (L/min/m ²)						
	40	80	200	400	600	1000	1400
>500	90	58	58	100*	86	72	100*
250 - 500	100*	100*	100	100*	100*	100*	100*
150 - 250	90	82	26	100*	100*	67	90
105 - 150	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*	100*	100
75 - 105	100*	92	74	82	77	68	76
53 - 75	Undefined ^a	56	100*	72	69	50	80
20 - 53	54	100*	54	33	36	40	31
8 - 20	67	52	25	21	17	20	20
5 – 8	33	29	11	12	9	7	19
<5	13	0	0	0	0	0	4
All particle sizes by mass balance	70.4	63.8	53.9	47.5	46.0	43.7	49.0

^a An outlier in the feed sample sieve data resulted in a negative removal efficiency for this size fraction.

* Removal efficiencies were calculated to be above 100%. Calculated values ranged between 101 and 171% (average 128%). See text and [Bulletin # CETV 2016-11-0001](#) for more information.

Table 2. Removal efficiencies (%) of the EFO4 at surface loading rates above the bypass rate of 535 L/min/m²

Particle size fraction (µm)	Surface loading rate (L/min/m ²)		
	600	1000	1400
>500	89	83	100*
250 - 500	90	100*	92
150 - 250	90	67	100*
105 - 150	85	92	77
75 - 105	80	71	65
53 - 75	60	31	36
20 - 53	33	43	23
8 - 20	17	23	15
5 – 8	10	3	3
<5	0	0	0
All particle sizes by mass balance	41.7	39.7	34.2

* Removal efficiencies were calculated to be above 100%. Calculated values ranged between 103 and 111% (average 107%). See text and [Bulletin # CETV 2016-11-0001](#) for more information.

Figure 3 compares the particle size distribution (PSD) of the three sample average of the test sediment to the PSD of the sediment retained by the EF4 at each of the tested surface loading rates. Figure 4 shows the same graph for the EFO4 unit at surface loading rates above the bypass rate of 535 L/min/m².

As expected, the capture efficiency for fine particles in both units was generally found to decrease as surface loading rates increased.




Figure 3. Particle size distribution of sediment retained in the EF4 in relation to the injected test sediment average.




Figure 4. Particle size distribution of sediment retained in the EFO4 in relation to the injected test sediment average at surface loading rates above the bypass rate of 535 L/min/m²

Table 4 shows the results of the sediment scour and re-suspension test for the EF4 unit. The EFO4 was not tested as it was reasonably assumed that scour rates would be lower given that flow bypass occurs at a lower surface loading rate. The scour test involved preloading 10.2 cm of fresh test sediment into

the sedimentation sump of the device. The sediment was placed on a false floor to mimic a device filled to 50% of the maximum recommended sediment storage depth. Clean water was run through the device at five surface loading rates over a 30 minute period. Each flow rate was maintained for 5 minutes with a one minute transition time between flow rates. Effluent samples were collected at one minute sampling intervals and analyzed for Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC) and PSD by recognized methods. The effluent samples were subsequently adjusted based on the background concentration of the influent water. Typically, the smallest 5% of particles captured during the 40 L/min/m² sediment capture test is also used to adjust the concentration, as per the method described in [Bulletin # CETV 2016-09-0001](#). However, since the composites of effluent concentrations were below the Reporting Detection Limit of the Laser Diffraction PSD methodology, this adjustment was not made. Results showed average adjusted effluent sediment concentrations below 5 mg/L at all tested surface loading rates.

It should be noted that the EF4 starts to internally bypass water at 1135 L/min/m², potentially resulting in the dilution of effluent concentrations, which would not normally occur under typical field conditions because the field influent concentration would contain a much higher sediment concentration than during the lab test. Recalculation of effluent concentrations to account for dilution at surface loading rates above the bypass rate showed sediment effluent concentrations to be below 1.6 mg/L.

Table 4. Scour test adjusted effluent sediment concentration.

Run	Surface loading rate (L/min/m ²)	Run time (min)	Background sample concentration (mg/L)	Adjusted effluent suspended sediment concentration (mg/L) ^a	Average (mg/L)
1	200	1:00	<RDL	11.9	4.6
		2:00		7.0	
		3:00		4.4	
		4:00		2.2	
		5:00		1.0	
		6:00		1.2	
2	800	7:00	<RDL	1.1	0.7
		8:00		0.9	
		9:00		0.6	
		10:00		1.4	
		11:00		0.1	
		12:00		0	
3	1400	13:00	<RDL	0	0
		14:00		0.1	
		15:00		0	
		16:00		0	
		17:00		0	
		18:00		0	
4	2000	19:00	1.2	0.2	0.2
		20:00		0	
		21:00		0	
		22:00		0.7	
		23:00		0	
		24:00		0.4	

5	2600	25:00	1.6	0.3	0.4
		26:00		0.4	
		27:00		0.7	
		28:00		0.4	
		29:00		0.2	
		30:00		0.4	

^a The adjusted effluent suspended sediment concentration represents the actual measured effluent concentration minus the background concentration. For more information see [Bulletin # CETV 2016-09-0001](#).

The results of the light liquid re-entrainment test used to evaluate the unit's capacity to prevent re-entrainment of light liquids are reported in Table 5. The test involved preloading 58.3 L (corresponding to a 5 cm depth over the collection sump area of 1.17m²) of surrogate low-density polyethylene beads within the oil collection skirt and running clean water through the device continuously at five surface loading rates (200, 800, 1400, 2000, and 2600 L/min/m²). Each flow rate was maintained for 5 minutes with approximately 1 minute transition time between flow rates. The effluent flow was screened to capture all re-entrained pellets throughout the test.

Table 5. Light liquid re-entrainment test results for the EFO4.

Surface Loading Rate (L/min/m ²)	Time Stamp	Amount of Beads Re-entrained			
		Mass (g)	Volume (L) ^a	% of Pre-loaded Mass Re-entrained	% of Pre-loaded Mass Retained
200	62	0	0	0.00	100
800	247	168.45	0.3	0.52	99.48
1400	432	51.88	0.09	0.16	99.83
2000	617	55.54	0.1	0.17	99.84
2600	802	19.73	0.035	0.06	99.94
Total Re-entrained		295.60	0.525	0.91	--
Total Retained		32403	57.78	--	99.09
Total Loaded		32699	58.3	--	--

^a Determined from bead bulk density of 0.56074 g/cm³

Variances from testing Procedure

The following minor deviations from the *Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil-Grit Separators* (Version 3.0, June 2014) have been noted:

- During the capture test, the 40 L/min/m² and 80 L/min/m² surface loading rates were evaluated over 3 and 2 days respectively due to the long duration needed to feed the required minimum of 11.3 kg of test sediment into the unit at these lower flow rates. Pumps were shut down at the end of each intermediate day, and turned on again the following morning. The target flow rate was re-established within 30 seconds of switching on the pump. This procedure may have allowed sediments to be captured that otherwise may have exited the unit if the test was continuous. On the basis of practical considerations, this variance was approved by the verifier prior to testing.

2. During the scour test, the coefficient of variation (COV) for the lowest flow rate tested (200 L/min/m²) was 0.07, which exceeded the specified limit of 0.04 target specified in the OGS Procedure. A pump capable of attaining the highest flow rate of 3036 L/min had difficulty maintaining the lowest flow of 234 L/min but still remained within +/- 10% of the target flow and is viewed as having very little impact on the observed results. Similarly, for the light liquid re-entrainment test the COV for the flow rate of the 200 L/min/m² run was 0.049, exceeding the limit of 0.04, but is believed to introduce negligible bias.
3. Due to pressure build up in the filters, the runs at 1000 L/min/m² for the Stormceptor® EF4 and 1000 and 1400 L/min/m² for the Stormceptor® EFO4 were slightly shorter than the target. The run times were 54, 59 and 43 minutes respectively, versus targets of 60 and 50 minutes. The final feed samples were timed to coincide with the end of the run. Since >25 lbs of sediment was fed, the shortened time did not invalidate the runs.

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 Inc. to support the performance claim included the following: Performance test report prepared by Good Harbour Laboratories, and dated September 8, 2017; the report is based on testing completed in accordance with the Procedure for Laboratory Testing of Oil-Grit Separators (Version 3.0, June 2014).

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 Stormceptor® EF and EFO OGS 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@globeperformance.com

Limitation of verification - Registration: GPS-ETV_VR2023-11-15_Imbrium-SC

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.