

**TAC Minutes
GA DOT Office
Macon, GA
February 8, 2011**

In attendance were:

Jim Sloan	Britt Faucette
Marc Mastronardi	Reece Parker
Joshua Escue	Dewey Richardson
Greg Evans	Guerry Thomas
Diane Guthrie	Lauren Zdunczyk
Davie Biagi	Adena Fullard

Lauren Zdunczyk opened the meeting and addressed the election of a TAC Chairman. Greg Evans made the motion to address this at the end of meeting. TAC Members agreed to table the discussion. Ms. Zdunczyk reviewed the purpose of the grant.

Ms. Zdunczyk then discussed the need for standardized testing that can be conducted when someone has a new product for consideration. The TAC discussed the criteria to be used when considering the following E&S products and practices:

Silt Fencing: Ms. Zdunczyk asked if efficiency should be included in the criteria. Mr. Escue gave the opinion that efficiency should be taken into consideration. Mr. Mastronardi asked if by efficiency we mean flow rate. Mr. Escue confirmed that this is what he meant. Mr. Mastronardi then asked if there is a problem with the fencing currently being used. The suggestion was made to set benchmarks that any new fencing products would have to meet to be as efficient as those currently being used. Ms. Fullard agreed that efficiency standards are needed. The TAC then discussed treatment trains, design & installations of BMPs. Also the application of different products was addressed. The TAC agreed that when someone comes with a new product for approval there need to be two efficiency standards: flow rate and trapping capacity. A discussion was also held on whether the current standards in the Manual are sufficient. Mr. Mastronardi asked if there was a standardized test that could be adopted. Ms. Zdunczyk stated that this is something that she can research. Dr. Faucette talked about the current method of testing sediment barriers – he gave the opinion that it isn't a very good test. Dr. Faucette also discussed some other testing that is currently available. There is a large scale field test that hasn't been approved yet as a standard test, and there another test that allows you to adjust the amount of water you use when testing.

Ms. Zdunczyk asked if those that don't meet the new efficiency standards will be allotted any time before being removed from the QPL. Mr. Mastronardi stated that those will be immediately removed from the list.

Inlet sediment traps: The TAC agreed that flow rates and applications need to be considered. The TAC also agreed that differentiation should be made between the different types of sediment traps and sediment storage. Ms. Fullard asked if the TAC is trying to encourage new products or justify what we have already approved. Ms. Zdunczyk stated that the TAC is not trying to discourage new products, but attempting to set standards that the products must meet in order to be approved for use. Mr. Parker stated that one thing that must be addressed is the ability to handle emergency overflow. The suggestion was made to provide maintenance intervals rather than other specifics like cleaning out at 1/3 full, etc. The TAC discussed the fact that the Manual is too restrictive in the profile description of some products. Efficiency, trapping & flow rates will be considered for this product.

Check Dams: The TAC discussed the current rock prices as well as the availability of different types of rock. The TAC also discussed the ability to use silt fencing as check dams. The only use for a check dam is to reduce velocity. The suggestion was made to look at flow rates and measure the ability of the dam to slow the rate of flow. The TAC discussed designing tests to reflect the various soil types of different areas of the state. This enables specific criteria to be set according to the area of the state that a product/practice will be used in. The TAC agrees that there has to be some exclusions in the Manual. The suggestion was also made to break the Manual down into North GA, Piedmont & Coastal regions. The TAC also discussed slope parameters when suggesting different products and practices. Mr. Sloan suggested the planning section include different the applications for products which would enable the designer to select the BMP for the proper situation. The efficiency of using silt fence as a check dam was also discussed. Mr. Mastronardi will bring in the DOT specs for the committee to look at. In the Manual, the purpose of the check dam needs to be detailed: They are not used for sediment storage only to slow down the flow.

Channel Stabilization: Ms. Zdunczyk stated that there have been several questions regarding the use of plastics liners for channel stabilization. Dr. Faucette stated that this is probably just for temporary not permanent use. Dr. Faucette also said there is a good ASTM standard for channel liners (D6460). Dr. Faucette also informed the TAC that that the Texas DOT has a lab, and there is also a lab in South Carolina that conducts testing. Mr. Mastronardi stated that GDOT and GA Tech are also doing research projects. Ms. Biagi stated that the end result of the stabilization should be aesthetically pleasing.

PAM – Mr. Parker stated that no one is using this product. Mr. Escue said that his company was in the forefront when PAM was initially introduced, and that the product has fallen out of favor due to cost and inspection difficulties. Mr. Escue stated that it **MUST** be used in a treatment train because it greatly enhances the efficiency of the train. The TAC agreed that the current specifics for PAM are correct in the book. Mr. Mastronardi stated that many suppliers won't sell PAM to you without out you first having a soil sample. The TAC discussed requiring the plans to have soil testing criteria detailed on them. Mr. Escue stated that there is a problem with people getting the application rates correct.

Tackifiers and Binders: The TAC agreed to remove product and trade names from the Manual. The TAC agreed that there is not really a performance standard for tackifiers and binders. The Erosion Technology Council is developing their own standards for these. The TAC recommends that emulsified asphalt be removed as an option.

TAC Discussion topics:

- Application and/or placement of products need to be set for each BMP.
- Ms. Fullard stated that wording in green book should not be so suggestive the words “should, shouldn’t, may, and recommended” need to be replaced with “shall, will, can, and can not”
- The TAC agreed that efficiency, flow, and trapping are the areas that should be looked at when setting standards.
- The TAC agreed to use the current DOT profile/standards and to add efficiency and trapping. Also discussed was the difficulty in setting longevity standards.
- Ms. Zdunczyk stated that the treatment train goes back to the plan design. The TAC agreed that performance standards must be set for the various parts of the train. The TAC also agreed that treatment trains be encouraged in the Manual.
- Mr. Mastronardi discussed merging the Manual with the Stormwater Bluebook. Ms. Zdunczyk stated that discussion had been held about adding this information to the plan design section of the Manual. Ms. Fullard stated that when combining the two, the language should be such that it does not affect the ordinances of Local Issuing Authorities.
- Mr. Sloan discussed implementing LID in site design and how the requirements for this type of development also address erosion control. Mr. Sloan also suggested addressing this issue in the planning section of the Manual.
- Mr. Richardson stated that in 2013 they are looking at doing a new MS4 permit.

TAC Discussion Questions:

- How are we going to verify that the products are up to the standards?
- Do the producers/developers pay for the testing?
- The TAC agreed to expand the plan design section of the Manual to provide guidance in the applications of BMPs.
- The TAC agreed to table the election of a committee chairman until the next meeting.

The next meeting will be in late April or early May in Athens. Ms. Zdunczyk will send members a list of possible dates.