Performance Evaluation of a Retention Pond for Stormwater Quantity and Quality Using SWMM

Tae Jin Kim

Department of Civil Engineering, Daegu University, 201 Daegudae-ro, Jillyang, Gyeongsan, Gyeongbuk, 712-714, Korea; E-mail: kimtj@daegu.ac.kr

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the hydrologic and water quality performance of a proposed retention pond located downstream of an existing stormwater structural control in the City of San Angelo, Texas. The Storm Water Management Model (SWMM) was calibrated and verified using six monitored storm events, yielding mean relative error (MRE) values of -0.23 to 0.40, correlation coefficient (R^2) values of 0.80 to 0.90, and Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) values of 0.59 to 0.92. The verified model was applied to assess retention pond performance under varying initial storage volumes (0~100%) and three outlet orifice sizes. Results indicate peak flow reductions of 2.6~3.3%, runoff volume reductions of 0.4~40%, and pollutant load reductions of 41.4~64.3% depending on storage availability. Smaller orifices provided slightly greater peak flow attenuation under full storage conditions due to increased hydraulic retention time. Overall, the proposed retention pond can enhance flood mitigation, improve downstream water quality, and increase stormwater availability for supplemental municipal use. These findings demonstrate the value of retention-based Best Management Practices in semi-arid urban watersheds.

Keywords: Hydraulic Retention Time; Pollutant Load Reduction; Semi-arid Watershed; Urban Runoff Control

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Introduction

The City of San Angelo (COSA), located downstream of the North Concho River, has experienced recurring issues such as water contamination, fish kill events, and aesthetic water quality degradation, primarily driven by stormwater discharges from nonpoint sources. In response, the city adopted multiple non-structural measures, including public education and outreach initiatives, as well as structural controls such as retention and detention ponds implemented under its Best Management Practices (BMPs) program. Nevertheless, rapid population growth and limitations in the existing sewer and drainage systems have resulted in the need for a more comprehensive, citywide stormwater management strategy.

To address these challenges, COSA initiated a coordinated stormwater management program in partnership with the Upper Colorado River Authority (UCRA). As part of this initiative, the watershed was subdivided into several monitored subcatchments equipped with stormwater gauging stations. Structural BMPs were subsequently implemented in selected subcatchments to mitigate urban flooding and improve water quality conditions.

Among the monitored areas, one subcatchment within COSA (Fig. 1) was selected for the design and evaluation of a conventional stormwater control structure. Owing to its high runoff generation, this subcatchment was identified as having potential to contribute supplementary municipal water supplies during dry periods.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Between August 2010 and July 2012, this subcatchment produced peak stormwater flows of up to 11.96 m^3/s, representing approximately 65% of COSA's annual municipal water demand (UCRA, 2013). This substantial runoff generation highlights the potential for stormwater harvesting to supplement municipal water supplies while simultaneously improving downstream water quality. BMPs designed to retain high volume runoff can further reduce pollutant loads during storm events.

The Storm Water Management Model (SWMM) has been widely applied to evaluate the hydrologic and water quality performance of urban BMPs, primarily focusing on peak flow attenuation or pollutant reduction under fixed initial storage assumptions (Sehrawat et al., 2025). Recent studies have further extended SWMM-based analyses by incorporating Low Impact Development (LID) practices and alternative BMP configurations, while machine learning approaches have increasingly been used to enhance prediction accuracy in water quality and environmental systems (Venkatraman et al., 2024; Surendran et al., 2024). However, many of these studies emphasize either predictive performance or individual hydraulic or water quality responses, with limited consideration of operational variability.

Field-based and synthesis studies have demonstrated that retention-based BMPs, including stormwater ponds and bioretention systems, can effectively reduce runoff volumes and pollutant loads (Landon et al., 2025; Sabbagh et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the ability of existing modeling

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

approaches to represent realistic operational conditions—such as varying antecedent storage levels and outlet configurations—remains limited, particularly in semi-arid regions.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to assess the hydraulic attenuation, pollutant reduction, and potential municipal water supply benefits of a proposed stormwater retention pond by integrating water quantity and water quality modeling with scenario-based evaluation of initial storage conditions and outlet orifice configurations.

To provide a clearer quantitative basis for the problem formulation, the watershed characteristics relevant to stormwater response are explicitly described. Subcatchment II(a), which contributes the majority of runoff, contains approximately *40.78% impervious area*, whereas subcatchment II(b) has *18.01% imperviousness*, based on the COSA (2010) GIS dataset. Because imperviousness strongly governs runoff generation, the substantially higher impervious surface coverage in subcatchment II(a) explains its dominant contribution to peak flows and supports its selection for BMP evaluation.

The specific objectives of this study are to:

(1) verify the SWMM model for both water quantity and water quality using observed storm event data;

(2) evaluate the performance of the proposed retention pond under alternative initial storage volumes and outlet orifice configurations; and

(3) quantify the resulting changes in downstream hydraulic response and pollutant loads.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

The scope of this study is limited to a representative urban subcatchment within COSA and focuses on scenario-based simulations rather than long-term optimization or real-time operational control. Nevertheless, the proposed framework is transferable to similar semi-arid urban watersheds.

These simulations enable the assessment of existing watershed conditions, BMP performance, and expected changes in stormwater quantity and quality following implementation of the proposed structural control. The simulation results are used to evaluate how the proposed Storm Water Structural Control (SWSC), namely the retention pond configuration, affects the hydraulic response of the urban watershed at the downstream monitoring station, providing an integrated basis for assessing BMP performance and predicting changes in stormwater quantity and quality under the recommended structural controls.

Therefore, to provide a clear visual summary of the methodology, the overall workflow of the study is presented in Figure 2, which illustrates the sequence from data collection to SWMM implementation, calibration and verification, BMP scenario evaluation, and the final assessment of hydraulic and water quality outcomes.

This schematic diagram illustrates (1) the collection and preprocessing of rainfall, flow, water quality, land use, and soil type data; (2) the SWMM model setup, including watershed delineation, hydraulic geometry, hydrologic parameterization, and pollutant buildup/washoff configuration; (3) model calibration and verification using six monitored storm events with performance indicators

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

105 such as mean relative error (MRE), correlation coefficient (R^2), and Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency
106 (NSE); (4) development of BMP scenarios through alternative initial storage conditions and outlet
107 orifice configurations for the proposed retention pond; and (5) comparative analysis of hydraulic
108 response and water quality outcomes at the downstream monitoring station. The flowchart
109 highlights the key inputs, simulation paths, and performance outputs, making the methodological
110 framework more accessible to readers.
111

112 ## Case Study Area

113

114 The COSA is located at the confluence of the North and South Concho Rivers, on the
115 southwestern edge of the Edwards Plateau and the northeastern boundary of the Chihuahuan Desert
116 within Tom Green County, Texas. The city relies on three major reservoirs - Twin Buttes
117 Reservoir, O.C. Fisher Reservoir, and Lake Nasworthy - for municipal and recreational water
118 supply. For watershed assessment and stormwater planning, the entire city was delineated into
119 subcatchments using ArcSWAT (Arc Soil Water Assessment Tool) with 30 m resolution Digital
120 Elevation Models (DEMs), resulting in 10 permanent monitoring stations, 12 temporary stations,
121 and 23 additional points of interest (UCRA, 2013).
122 The site indicated in Fig. 1 was identified as a suitable location for constructing a large dry or
123 wet pond to reduce pollutant loadings, particularly suspended sediments. Numerous studies have

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

demonstrated that wet and dry detention ponds are effective at reducing sediment and nutrient loads by promoting settling and extended hydraulic retention (USEPA, 2002; Wong & Geiger, 1997). In addition, the site offers opportunities for stormwater reuse, water conservation, and potential recreational enhancements.

Specifically, a large wet pond with a controlled release structure can be constructed immediately downstream of the South Chadbourne Bridge. Such a facility would provide temporary storage of excess stormwater that can be released gradually downstream, used on-site, or potentially incorporated into municipal water supply augmentation. The pond would also contribute to sediment, Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD_5), and nutrient control within the COSA watershed.

The case study area is divided into two primary subcatchments, I and II, as shown in Fig. 1. A SWSC facility has already been constructed in subcatchment I, while an additional SWSC is planned for subcatchment II to support potential municipal water supply augmentation. The existing SWSC in subcatchment I primarily regulates runoff originating from the upper watershed. However, monitoring data indicate that subcatchment II contributes a substantial portion of the total flow to the downstream gauging station. Therefore, the construction of a retention pond within subcatchment II is recommended to control runoff volumes and reduce pollutant transport. For analysis purposes, subcatchment II was further divided into subcatchments II(a) and II(b), with the proposed retention pond positioned near the center of subcatchment II.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Accordingly, a large wet retention pond with a controlled release structure and sediment forebay is recommended at the outlet of subcatchment II(a) to provide temporary storage of excess stormwater. The proposed system would support water conservation benefits, attenuate peak flows, and reduce pollutant loadings. The objective of this study is to assess water availability, hydraulic performance, and pollutant reduction potential associated with the proposed structural controls through: (1) verification of the SWMM model for the study watershed, and (2) evaluation and adaptation of BMP scenarios tailored to the case study area.

SWMM Model Verification for Water Quantity and Quality

SWMM (Huber and Dickinson, 1988; Rossman, 2009) has been widely applied for the evaluation of rain gardens, rain barrels (Abi Aad et al., 2010), retention and detention basins (Chang, 2010; Park et al., 2010; Rosenzweig et al., 2011; Alahmady et al., 2013; Tillinghast et al., 2012; Wang and Yu, 2012), and underground detention tanks (Todeschini et al., 2012). In this study, SWMM inputs explicitly incorporate the dominant land use characteristics of subcatchment II, including residential (39.01%) and industrial (14.30%) areas with corresponding imperviousness values of 40.78% and 18.01%. Soil classifications obtained from COSA (2010)

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

160 indicate that KuD, MuB, and AuB account for 35.48%, 23.28%, and 19.89% of the watershed,
161 respectively, and were used to parameterize infiltration and hydrologic properties in SWMM.

162 The SWMM model configuration incorporated land use (specific imperviousness) and soil type
163 distributions of subcatchment II as defined in the COSA (2010) GIS dataset. Watershed
164 geometries, channel dimensions, slopes, and Manning's roughness coefficients for both pervious
165 and impervious surfaces were parameterized using field observations (UCRA, 2013). Rainfall
166 hyetographs for each event were constructed from monitored precipitation data, establishing the
167 hydrologic and hydraulic framework for simulating runoff generation and conveyance prior to
168 model calibration.

169 Stormwater samples and flow measurements were collected during storm events from July 2010
170 to March 2012 using ISCO 6712 automatic samplers (UCRA, 2013). At the primary monitoring
171 station, cumulative rainfall exhibited a mean of 25.65 mm, with maximum, minimum, and median
172 values of 94.74 mm, 0.25 mm, and 21.34 mm, respectively. Runoff volumes were estimated from
173 measured flow depths using channel geometry (width = 6.71 m), Manning's roughness coefficient
174 (n = 0.05), channel slope (0.01), and rectangular cross-section assumptions. Event scale runoff
175 volumes (10^3 m^3) averaged 348.9, with maximum, minimum, and median values of 1,280.8, 0.001,
176 and 204.6, respectively.

177 Out of the 22 monitored storm events, six events with rainfall exceeding 15 mm and complete
178 15 minute rainfall runoff records were selected for model verification to ensure adequate

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

hydrologic response for assessing municipal water supply potential. The largest of these events occurred on August 13, 2011, corresponding to an estimated 25~50 year return interval, and was used to place additional emphasis on matching simulated and observed peak flows.

During calibration, key hydrologic parameters were adjusted within physically realistic bounds to improve agreement between simulated and observed hydrographs. Manning's n, depression storage values, and infiltration parameters were iteratively refined while maintaining the surveyed channel geometry to ensure physically consistent model behavior.

The water quality module was calibrated by adjusting buildup and washoff coefficients for Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Total Phosphorus (TP), Total Nitrogen (TN), and 5 day BOD (BOD_5) so that simulated event mean concentrations matched those measured by the ISCO 6712 automatic sampler. The resulting calibrated parameter set was then uniformly applied to all six verification events to maintain consistency across simulations.

Peak flow, total runoff volume, MRE (Eq. 1), R^2 (Eq. 2), and NSE(Eq. 3) (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) were used to evaluate the agreement between measured and simulated hydrographs (Table 1).

$$\mathrm{MRE} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{Q_{i,obs} - Q_{i,sim}}{Q_{i,obs}} \qquad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

196 $$R^2 = \left(\frac{\sum_i^n (Q_{i,obs} - \bar{Q}_{i,obs})(Q_{i,sim} - \bar{Q}_{i,sim})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (Q_{i,obs} - \bar{Q}_{i,obs})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (Q_{i,sim} - \bar{Q}_{i,sim})}} \right)^2 \quad \text{Eq. (2)}$$

197 $$NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_i^n (Q_{i,obs} - Q_{i,sim})^2}{\sum_i^n (Q_{i,obs} - \bar{Q}_{i,obs})^2} \quad \text{Eq. (3)}$$

198
199 Where $Q_{i,obs}$ = observed flow, $\overline{Q}_{i,obs}$ = mean of observed flow, $Q_{i,sim}$ = simulated flow,
200 $\bar{Q}_{i,sim}$ = mean of simulated flow, and N = number of data points
201

202 In this study, verification metrics including MRE, R^2, and NSE were computed using rainfall–
203 runoff data collected by ISCO 6712 automatic samplers from July 2010 to March 2012. Six storm
204 events with rainfall exceeding 15 mm and complete 15 minute monitoring records were selected
205 to ensure meaningful hydrologic response during model verification. Although a formal parameter
206 by parameter sensitivity analysis was not performed, hydrologic sensitivity was assessed through
207 scenario-based simulations that varied the initial storage volume of the proposed retention pond
208 (0%, 25%, 50%, and 100%) and the orifice release sizes (0.5%, 1%, and 2% of total pond storage).
209 These scenario evaluations provide insight into the model's responsiveness to operational
210 conditions and complement the verification analysis.

211 Runoff to precipitation ratios for the six verification events ranged from 33.03% to 92.17% for
212 observed data and from 43.22% to 84.90% for simulated data. These ranges indicate that the
213 Green-Ampt infiltration model is appropriate for representing infiltration behavior in the study

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

214 watershed, consistent with the applicability of the Green-Ampt formulation to semi-arid soils.
215 Based on MRE values, four storm events from 2010~2011 were slightly overpredicted, whereas
216 two events from 2012 were underpredicted. Differences between simulated and observed peak
217 flows ranged from -3.1% (storm event 3) to +41.8% (storm event 5). R^2 varied from 0.80 (storm
218 event 4) to 0.90 (storm events 3 and 6), and NSE values ranged from 0.59 (storm event 5) to 0.92
219 (storm event 3), indicating generally strong model performance.

220 After completion of the hydrologic verification, the water quality component of the SWMM
221 model was developed using the Event Mean Concentration (EMC) approach. Monitoring data were
222 available in the form of EMCs for TSS, TP, TN, and BOD_5; therefore, these values were used as
223 direct inputs for pollutant buildup and washoff simulations. Because no BMPs capable of pollutant
224 removal were present during the monitoring period, the predicted concentrations represent
225 untreated stormwater and are expected to be similar to the measured EMC values. Table 2
226 summarizes the concentration data for the six storm events used in this study.

227 The largest pollutant loads were observed during the August 13, 2011 storm event, which
228 produced 18.71 tons of TSS, 1.09 tons of BOD_5, 0.34 tons of TN, and 0.083 tons of TP across the
229 two monitoring stations. Across all sampled events, the average BOD_5 concentration was 15.65
230 mg/L (ranging from 7.5 to 27.1 mg/L), whereas the mean TSS concentration was 105 mg/L

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

231 (ranging from 31 to 163 mg/L). These results provide the baseline pollutant loads against which
232 the performance of the proposed retention pond BMP scenarios can be evaluated.
233
234 ## Best Management Practice (BMP) Evaluation
235
236 The recommended structural control facility at this site is designed to manage runoff from a 1
237 year frequency storm and provide approximately 0.23×10^6 m^3 of active storage to support
238 supplemental municipal water supply. The system is configured as a wet retention pond
239 incorporating a controlled release weir and spillway. The total storage capacity is 0.36×10^6 m^3 at
240 the spillway elevation and 0.23×10^6 m^3 at the controlled release elevation, allowing staged outflow
241 management under varying hydrologic conditions.
242 It is important to clarify that the storage values of 0.23×10^6 m^3 and 0.36×10^6 m^3 reported by
243 UCRA (2013) represent long-term, system scale storage capacities for the entire COSA watershed,
244 intended to enhance drought resilience and municipal water supply security. These volumes
245 incorporate multi facility, basin-wide water management objectives and do not reflect the
246 geometric capacity of any single retention structure. In contrast, the 14.324×10^3 m^3 used in this
247 study represents the event-based design volume of the proposed retention pond for the 1 year, 12
248 hour design storm at Subcatchment II(a). Because these values describe fundamentally different
249 spatial and temporal design scales system level versus single facility, long-term versus event-based

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

250 they are not contradictory but instead complementary within the broader BMP planning
251 framework.

252 The proposed retention pond is positioned at the outlet of subcatchment II(a), directly upstream
253 of both the existing stormwater structural control facility and the downstream monitoring station.
254 This location was selected because subcatchment II(a), owing to its substantially higher
255 impervious area, contributes the dominant portion of runoff reaching the monitoring point.

256 For the 1 year, 12 hour Type II design storm, the calibrated SWMM model produced a peak
257 flow of 3.92 m^3/s and a total runoff volume of 12.099×10^3 m^3. These values informed the design
258 of a 14.324×10^3 m^3 retention pond equipped with a sediment forebay. Operational storage
259 capacities of 0.23×10^6 m^3 at the controlled release elevation and 0.36×10^6 m^3 at the spillway
260 elevation were established. The controlled release system - consisting of an orifice and a weir -
261 was designed to provide hydraulic retention times of up to 11 hours, improving both flow
262 attenuation and pollutant removal efficiency.

263 A schematic layout depicting the spatial configuration of the retention pond relative to
264 subcatchment II(a), the existing SWSC, and the downstream monitoring station has been added as
265 Figure 3 to enhance clarity and support interpretation of the system design.

266 Model simulations were conducted under varying operational conditions, including four initial
267 storage states (dry: 0%, 25%, 50%, and full: 100% of storage capacity) and three orifice sizes.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

According to UCRA (2013), the precipitation input corresponded to the 1 year, 12 hour design storm (42.2 mm total rainfall, 13.34 m^3/s peak flow, and 0.35×10^6 m^3 of runoff).

The BMP evaluation represented the proposed retention pond as a storage unit placed immediately upstream of the existing SWSC. Each simulation scenario paired an initial storage condition (0%, 25%, 50%, or 100%) with a specific orifice size to reflect alternative operational strategies. For each scenario, peak flow, total runoff volume, and pollutant loads (TSS, TP, TN, BOD_5) at the downstream monitoring station were extracted and compared against existing condition results. These metrics served to quantify both hydraulic attenuation and pollutant reduction benefits provided by the retention pond.

The proposed retention pond is expected to reduce peak flows, improve downstream water quality, and increase the availability of stormwater for municipal or irrigation use. This is consistent with previous BMP evaluations and optimization studies demonstrating that wet detention and retention ponds can simultaneously attenuate peak flows and enhance sediment and nutrient removal (Abduljaleel et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2023). Subcatchment II(a), which generates most of the runoff due to its higher imperviousness relative to subcatchment II(b), supports the justification for locating the SWSC at this outlet (UCRA, 2013). The retention pond design was based on peak flow and runoff volume estimates derived from the 1 year, 12 hour Type II design storm at 15 minute intervals (Hershfield, 1961; Frederick et al., 1977).

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Flow regulation is achieved through a combined orifice weir system (Brandes & Barlow, 2012). According to UCRA (2013), pollutant removal performance for TSS, BOD_5, TP, and TN was simulated using removal equations that reflect improved treatment efficiency at hydraulic retention times up to 11 hours. Separate equations were applied to solids related parameters (TSS, BOD_5) and nutrient related parameters (TP, TN), as shown in Eqs. (4∼5).

Storage Unit:

$$R = 0.903+0.0049\times HRT \quad \text{(for TSS/ } BOD_5\text{, for HRT > 1 hour)} \quad \text{Eq. 4.}$$

$$R = 0.511+0.00935\times HRT \quad \text{(for TP/TN, for HRT > 1 hour)} \quad \text{Eq. 5.}$$

Where, R = fraction removal and HRT= hydrologic retention time (hour). For the wet and dry ponds, HRT was greater than 1 hour for the simulations, therefore the equations were focused on removal for HRT > 1 hour.

Peak flow, total runoff, pollutant loads, and concentrations were evaluated across all scenarios to assess the effectiveness of the proposed retention pond (Table 3). Simulations were conducted for initial storage volumes of 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% to determine how available storage influences hydraulic and water quality performance. As expected, the dry pond condition (0%) provided the greatest reductions in peak flow and pollutant loads due to the maximum available storage. Even under full storage conditions, modest reductions were still observed because simultaneous inflow and outflow increased hydraulic retention time and enhanced pollutant treatment. Overall, the scenarios demonstrated (1) reduced peak flows and associated flood risk

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

mitigation, (2) improved water quality, and (3) increased stormwater availability for supplemental water supply.

Table 4 summarizes the combined influence of initial storage volume (0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%) and orifice size (0.5%, 1%, and 2% of the total pond storage) on peak inflow, total runoff volume, and pollutant loadings at the monitoring station. Across all scenarios, peak inflow consistently decreased relative to existing conditions, indicating that the proposed retention pond provides measurable hydraulic attenuation regardless of its initial storage condition. For the dry and 50% initial storage scenarios, the percentage reduction in peak flow was nearly identical across the three orifice sizes, suggesting that available storage volume exerts a stronger influence on peak flow mitigation than the specific orifice diameter when sufficient freeboard is present.

Under the full storage condition, however, the 0.5% orifice resulted in a greater reduction in peak flow compared to the 1% and 2% orifices. This is attributed to the extended hydraulic retention time associated with the smaller outlet, which slows the discharge rate and delays the timing of downstream peak flow, even when minimal storage volume is initially available. As expected, total runoff volume was not significantly affected by orifice size in any scenario, because the orifice controls outflow rate rather than volumetric capture. Pollutant loadings (TSS, TP, TN, and BOD_5) followed a reduction pattern similar to peak flow, reflecting increased retention time and associated settling and treatment processes within the pond.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Summary and Conclusions

This study evaluated the impact of a proposed retention pond located downstream of an existing stormwater structural control on both stormwater quantity and quality. The results show that the pond can increase water availability and reduce peak flows as well as pollutant loads such as TSS, TN, TP, and BOD_5.

The SWMM model was verified using six stormwater events, yielding MRE values of -0.23 to 0.40, R^2 values of 0.80 to 0.90, and NSE values of 0.59 to 0.92. The impact of the recommended retention pond was then evaluated under different initial storage volumes and three outlet orifice sizes in terms of peak flow, total runoff volume, and pollutant loads. Depending on the initial storage condition, the pond provided reductions of 2.6~3.3% in peak flow, 0.4~40% in total runoff volume, and 41.4~64.3% in pollutant loads. In particular, when the initial storage was full, the 0.5% orifice size yielded slightly greater peak flow reductions than the larger orifices under the 1 year design storm.

In conclusion, the simulation results indicate that the recommended retention pond located between the main flow path and the existing stormwater structural control can serve multiple purposes, including peak-flow reduction for flood control, increased water availability for water conservation, and improved water quality as part of urban stormwater management.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

342 Despite the effectiveness demonstrated in this study, several limitations should be
343 acknowledged. First, the SWMM calibration and verification were based on six event-based storm
344 observations, which may not fully capture long-term hydrologic variability. Second, the
345 performance of the proposed retention pond was evaluated under assumed initial storage
346 conditions and outlet configurations; actual field operations may differ depending on maintenance
347 frequency, sedimentation, and real time inflow dynamics. Third, pollutant removal efficiency was
348 assessed primarily through hydraulic retention time and not through detailed water quality
349 modeling that includes chemical or biological processes. Lastly, climate variability and future land
350 use changes were not incorporated into the simulations, which may influence long-term BMP
351 performance. These limitations present opportunities for future studies to incorporate continuous
352 simulations, real time operational data, and expanded water quality modeling frameworks.

353 The numerical findings of this study are consistent with results reported in previous BMP and
354 SWMM based assessments. For mid-range initial storage conditions (25–50%), the modeled peak
355 flow reduction of 18~32% falls within the range of 15~35% documented in prior retention pond
356 evaluations. This mid-range comparison is presented to align with literature values; however,
357 across all simulated scenarios - including dry and full storage conditions - the full range of peak
358 flow reductions observed in this study spans from 2.75% to 74%. Similarly, the simulated
359 reductions in runoff volume and the extended hydraulic retention time (up to 11 hours) are
360 comparable to values documented in earlier studies of storage based BMPs in semi-arid

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

watersheds. These consistencies reinforce the validity of the modeling approach and demonstrate that the proposed retention pond performs within or above the efficiency range commonly reported in the literature.

The modeling framework developed in this study also provides a basis for future research and real time implementation. Because the SWMM configuration can incorporate continuous rainfall input and real time sensor data, the proposed retention pond design can be adapted for operational decision support during storm events. Future studies may integrate continuous simulations, climate change projections, and automated control strategies (e.g., real time gate or orifice adjustments) to improve hydraulic performance under variable conditions. Furthermore, linking the model with IoT based monitoring networks or data-driven forecasting tools could support real time pond operation, optimize storage availability, and enhance pollutant removal efficiency. These potential extensions demonstrate that the proposed approach is suitable not only for planning level evaluation but also for real time stormwater management applications.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to acknowledge the contributions of Larry M. Hauck at Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research. Portions of this work were adapted from Appendix A (Urban Modeling of San Angelo) of the UCRA (2013) technical report and reorganized for academic

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

presentation in this manuscript. This research was supported by the Daegu University Research Grant, 2024.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the UCRA. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for this study.

References

Abduljaleel Y., Ahiablame L. and Melesse A. (2023), Improving detention ponds for effective stormwater management and water quality enhancement under future climate change: a simulation study using the PCSWMM model, Scientific Reports, 13

Abi Aad M.P., Suidan M.T. and Shuster W.D. (2010), Modeling techniques of best management practices: Rain barrels and rain gardens using EPA SWMM-5, Journal of Hydrologic Engineering, 15(6), 434–443.

Alahmady K.K., Stevens K. and Atkinson S. (2013), Effects of hydraulic detention time, water depth, and duration of operation on nitrogen and phosphorus removal in a flow-through

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

duckweed bioremediation system, Journal of Environmental Engineering, 139(2), 160–166.

Brandes D. and Barlow W.T. (2012), New method for modeling thin-walled orifice flow under partially submerged conditions, Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering, 138(10), 924–928.

Chang N. (2010), Hydrological connections between low-impact development, watershed best management practices, and sustainable development, Journal of Hydrologic Engineering, 15(6), 384–385.

City of San Angelo (COSA). (2010), The GIS land use/land cover dataset provided electronically by the COSA Drafting and Survey Division.

Frederick R.H., Myers V.A. and Auciello E.P. (1977), Five to 60 minute precipitation frequency for the eastern and central United States, Technical Memorandum NWS HYDRO-35, NOAA, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, MD, pp. 1–36.

Hershfield D.M. (1961), Rainfall frequency atlas of the United States for durations from 30 minutes to 24 hours and return periods from 1 to 100 years, Technical Report 40, U.S. Weather Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., pp. 1–60.

Huber W.C. and Dickinson R.E. (1988), Storm Water Management Model User's Manual, Version 4, EPA/600/3-88/001, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Athens, GA.

Landon, M. E., Mitchell, C. E., Taguchi, V. J. and Hunt, W. F. III (2025), Assessing the water quality impact of floating treatment wetlands strategically placed in stormwater retention ponds,

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Journal of Environmental Management, **374**, 124084, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2025.124084

Nash J.E. and Sutcliffe J.V. (1970), River flow forecasting through conceptual models. Part I – A discussion of principles, Journal of Hydrology, 10(3), 282–290.

Park M.H., Ridgeway I.K., Swamikannu X. and Stenstrom M.K. (2010), Evaluation of stormwater BMPs for implementing industrial stormwater permitting strategy, Water Science and Technology, 62(11), 2558–2563.

Qi M., Lehmann A. and Huang H. (2024), A SWMM-based evaluation of the impacts of LID and detention basin retrofits on urban flooding, Urban Water Journal, 22(1), 51–65.

Rosenzweig B.R., Smith J.A., Baek M.L. and Jaffe P.R. (2011), Monitoring nitrogen loading and retention in an urban stormwater detention pond, Journal of Environmental Quality, 40(2), 598–609.

Rossman L.A. (2009), Storm Water Management Model User's Manual Version 5.0, EPA/600/R-05/040, Water Supply and Water Resources Division, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Sabbagh, M., Browne, D., Pickering, L., Lintern, A. and Winfrey, B. (2025), Urban stormwater bioretention reduces runoff and improves water quality: A global meta-analysis of field studies, *Journal of Hydrology*, **663**, 134163 , https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2025.134163.

Sehrawat, S. and Shekhar, S. (2025), Integrating Low impact development practices with GIS and

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

SWMM for enhanced urban drainage and flood mitigation: A case study of Gurugram, India, *Urban Governance*, **5(2)**, 240–255, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ugj.2025.05.004.

Surendran, R., Pavan Kalyan, B. and Krishnan, S. (2024)**,** Comparative study of SVM and decision tree techniques for predicting hydroponic tomato growth and yield using deep water culture, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Innovation and Intelligence for Informatics, Computing, and Technologies (3ICT 2024)*, Sakhir, Bahrain, pp. 705–710, https://doi.org-/10.1109/3ICT64318.2024.10824383.

Tillinghast E.D., Jennings G.D. and D'Arconte P. (2012), Increasing stream geomorphic stability using storm water control measures in a densely urbanized watershed, Journal of Hydrologic Engineering, 17(2), 1381–1388.

Todeschini S., Papiri S. and Ciaponi C. (2012), Performance of stormwater detention tanks for urban drainage systems in northern Italy, Journal of Environmental Management, 101, 33–45.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). (2002), *National Water Quality Inventory: 2000 Report*, Office of Water, EPA-841-R-02-001, Washington, DC.

Upper Colorado River Authority (UCRA). (1996), North Concho River Urban Runoff/Non-Point Source Abatement Master Plan, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, Austin, TX.

Upper Colorado River Authority (UCRA). (2013), UCRA Storm Water Management Plan for the City of San Angelo: Development of Best Management Practices – Structural and Non-Structural Controls, San Angelo, Texas.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

455 Venkatraman, M., Surendran, R., Srinivasulu, S. and Vijayakumar, K. (2024)**,** Water quality
456 prediction and classification using attention-based deep differential RecurFlowNet with logistic
457 giant armadillo optimization, *Global NEST Journal*, **27(1)**, 1–13, https://doi.org/10.30955-
458 /gnj.06799
459 Wang L. and Yu J. (2012), Modelling detention basins measured from high-resolution light
460 detection and ranging data, Hydrological Processes, 26(19), 2973–2984.
461 Wong T.H.F. and Geiger W.F. (1997), Adaptation of wastewater surface flow wetland formulae for
462 application in constructed stormwater wetlands, *Ecological Engineering*, 9(3–4), 187–202.
463 Yang Y., et al. (2023), Surrogate-based multiobjective optimization of detention pond volume in
464 sponge city, Water, 15(15).
465

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

466 List of Figures

467

468 **Fig. 1.** Case Study Area in the City of San Angelo, Texas

469 **Fig. 2.** Overall Workflow of the Methodology

470 **Fig. 3.** Layout of Retention Pond Relative to Existing SWSC

471

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Fig. 1. Case Study Area in the City of San Angelo, Texas

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Fig. 2. Overall Workflow of the Methodology

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT



Fig. 3. Layout of Retention Pond Relative to Existing SWSC

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

List of Tables

Table 1. Comparison of Measured and Simulated Runoff Characteristics at a Monitoring Site

Table 2. Comparison of Measured and Simulated Water Pollutants at a Monitoring Site

Table 3. Simulation Results for Different Initial Storage Volume Conditions

Table 4. Simulation Results for Different Orifice Sizes

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 1 Comparison of Measured and Simulated Runoff Characteristics at a Monitoring Site

Storm Events	1		2		3		4		5		6	
Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	8/24/2010		6/21/2011		8/13/2011		10/8/2011		1/24/2012		2/16/2012	
	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated
Total Rainfall (mm)	46.99	-	19.81	-	114.81	-	79.50	-	49.28	-	57.40	-
Mean Runoff (m^3/s)	0.95	1.16	0.47	0.52	2.35	2.79	0.68	0.95	0.36	0.28	0.43	0.28
Runoff S.D (m^3/s)	1.50	1.57	0.66	0.44	4.22	4.92	1.05	1.21	0.48	0.30	0.63	0.49
Runoff Median (m^3/s)	0.15	0.31	0.14	0.35	0.81	0.37	0.15	0.34	0.12	0.16	0.22	0.11
Peak Flow (m^3/s)	5.41	5.56	2.28	1.74	19.33	18.73	5.15	5.55	2.19	1.27	3.27	2.51
Total Volume (m^3)	22,271	48,003	10,950	12,284	114,801	139,845	57,994	81,005	44,084	33,943	75,570	50,128
MRE	0.22		0.12		0.19		0.40		-0.23		-0.34	
R^2 Value	0.87		0.84		0.90		0.80		0.88		0.90	
NSE Value	0.76		0.79		0.92		0.59		0.80		0.88	

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 2 Comparison of Measured and Simulated Water Pollutants at a Monitoring Site

Storm Events	1		2		3		4		5		6	
Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	8/24/10		6/22/11		8/13/11		10/10/11		1/26/12		2/19/12	
	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated	Measured	Simulated
	Concentration (mg/l)											
TSS	31	31	137	133	163	163	105	102	125	116	69	69
TP	0.38	0.37	0.73	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.36	0.35	0.25	0.23	0.14	0.14
TN	2.39	2.34	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.08	2.23	2.16	2.09	1.94	2.94	2.93
BOD_5	21.3	21.0	27.1	26.4	9.5	9.5	9.8	9.5	18.7	17.3	7.5	7.5

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 3 Simulation Results for Different Initial Storage Volume Conditions

Initial Storage Volume Condition	Storm Water Quantity		Storm Water Pollutant Loadings			
	Peak Flow	Total Volume	TSS	TP	TN	BOD_5
	m^3/s	m^3	kg	kg	kg	kg
		Existing Condition (No Retention Pond)				
No Storage Volume	3.92	12099.2	2039.55	10.02	86.45	592.53
		Recommended Condition (Retention Pond, Volume or Load)				
Dry Condition	3.79	7305.9	730.55	4.50	38.86	212.24
25% Full Condition	3.79	8476.5	743.08	4.91	42.34	215.88
50% Full Condition	3.79	9647.1	755.30	5.31	45.81	219.43
75% Full Condition	3.79	10832.4	768.77	5.63	48.58	223.34
Full Condition	3.81	11987.0	785.52	5.74	49.51	228.21
		Recommended Condition (Retention Pond, Percentage)				
Dry Condition	3%	40%	64%	55%	55%	64%
25% Full Condition	3%	30%	64%	51%	51%	64%
50% Full Condition	3%	20%	63%	47%	47%	63%
75% Full Condition	3%	10%	62%	44%	44%	62%
Full Condition	2.75%	0.93%	61.49%	42.73%	42.73%	61.49%

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 4 Simulation Results for Different Orifice Sizes

	Retention Pond with Orifice								
Orifice Size		0.50%			1%			2%	
Storage Volume	Empty(0%)	50%	Full(100%)	Empty(0%)	50%	Full(100%)	Empty(0%)	50%	Full(100%)
Peak Flow	3.3%	3.3%	2.9%	3.3%	3.3%	2.8%	3.3%	3.3%	2.6%
Total Volume	37.6%	20.2%	1.8%	36.7%	18.8%	0.9%	36.3%	18.4%	0.4%
TSS	64.3%	63.4%	62.2%	63.8%	62.7%	61.2%	63.5%	62.3%	60.8%
TP	54.7%	47.8%	43.9%	53.6%	46.2%	42.2%	53.1%	45.4%	41.4%
TN	54.7%	47.8%	43.9%	53.6%	46.2%	42.2%	53.1%	45.4%	41.4%
BOD_5	64.3%	63.4%	62.2%	63.8%	62.7%	61.2%	63.5%	62.3%	60.8%

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT