

MINUTES
STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY BOARD
Forest Park, Georgia
January 5, 2005

Present were Stakeholder Advisory Board members Doug Easter, Jim Hamilton (Chair), James Magnus, Robert Ringer, Karim Shahlaee, Gregory Teague, Ben Thompson, Burns Wetherington and Aaron Varner. Members Mark Byrd, Alice Champagne, JoAnn Macrina, and Connie Wiggins were not in attendance. Also present were Soil and Water Commission employees John Carden and Michaelyn Rozar. Interested parties in attendance included Bettie Sleeth (Homebuilders of Georgia), Todd Edwards (Association of County Commissioners of Georgia), Seth Yurman (Georgia Water and Pollution Control Association), Laura Beall (Council for Quality Growth), Jim Gaskill (E&S Specialties, Inc) and Michael Barnhart (Environmental Consultant).

Mr. Hamilton opened the meeting by welcoming Board members and guests.

Agenda Items

1. Review and approve December 1, 2004 and December 15, 2004 meeting minutes.

On a motion by Dr. Shahlaee and seconded by Mr. Easter, the minutes of the December 1, 2004 and December 15, 2004 SAB meetings were approved contingent upon further review. The Board agreed to send emails if any changes were necessary.

2. Review comments from Attorney General's office regarding Rules and Regulations

Mr. Hamilton asked Ms. Rozar to summarize the changes that had been made to the Rules and Regulations. Ms. Rozar stated that after further policy and legal review by the Attorney General's office, the changes were as follows:

- Reference to statutory authority referenced at the end of each Rule.
- Designation of subparagraphs changes to be consistent with the Commission's existing Rules.
- Definition for "operator" has been removed as the term is not referenced in the Rules
- Definition of "Program Authority" amended to include EPD
- Removal of definition of "experience" as the term is defined appropriately for each certification level
- Certification Guidelines
 - Experience requirements for Level 1B and Level 2 certification: an individual may obtain the next lower level of certification in lieu of experience. This will ensure that individuals participating in the advanced levels of training have prior knowledge while adding a reasonable

alternative to 60-days or 6 months of experience. Application will not need to be signed and dated by an employer, as the certification statement is present.

- Term “or equivalent approved courses” was added to the exam only portions of the course descriptions
- Added Awareness Seminar - eligibility requirements for a “notice of satisfactory completion” included.
- Trainer/Instructor Guidelines
 - Because individuals designated as Land Surveyors and CPESC do not require college degrees but are designated by statute as design professionals, five years of professional licensure may serve in lieu of four-year college degree. These individuals, by statute, are still required to have 10 years of experience
 - Trainers/Instructors will be required to submit not just their class schedules but also course agendas and materials in order to ensure compliance with Commission approved materials.

3. Consensus vote on current Rules draft to be reviewed by Commission Board on 1/6/05. Letter to be issued

The Board briefly discussed the changes. On a motion by Mr. Teague and seconded by Mr. Varner, the Board unanimously agreed to offer a vote of confidence to the Commission Board concerning the Rules. Mr. Hamilton stated that he would send a letter on behalf of the Board to the Conservation Commission Board stating that the Board supports the Rules and Regulations.

4. Review timeline to complete course outlines, curriculum, and train the trainer courses. Review SAB meeting schedule

Mr. Hamilton commented that the Board having approved the curriculum for the Awareness course still would need to review the curriculum for the Level IA, IB and two courses as well as the Trainer/Instructor course. He recommended establishing a deadline of March 2 for approving the curricula.

The next meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Board will be held January 19, 2005 at the Center in Covington. A meeting will be held on February 2, 2005 in Marietta and will be hosted by Mr. Teague.

Mr. Easter recommended that testing sessions be offered as soon as possible. Mr. Magnus also advocated preparing exams and approving proctors as soon as possible so that exam sessions may be offered while courses are still being reviewed. Mr. Wetherington agreed.

Dr. Shahlaee stated that the best way for the Board to spend meeting time is by reviewing course material and agendas. He commented that the Level IA, Level IB and Level 2 courses must be reviewed and approved before the Trainer/Instructor courses can be reviewed.

Mr. Easter advocated preparing exams first so that course agendas could be altered to fit testing objectives. Dr. Shahlaee disagreed stating that agenda discussions should be based on what an individual needs to know to do their job. The Board continued to discuss the merits of discussing exam questions before course agendas and curricula.

Mr. Thompson stated that this was a philosophical discussion and that as long as test questions matched the material the program would work.

5. Review course outline for Level IA course.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the Conservation Commission has been teaching the one-day NPDES course for several years. He commented that the Level IA would include 7-8 hours of instruction time with 45 minutes of examination. He stated that the course should include more material than what can be tested.

Mr. Magnus stated that several organizations other than the Conservation Commission are currently teaching the one-day course. He also stated that these courses had been approved by the EPD and SWCC. He reminded the Board that individuals attending these one-day courses would be taking the same exam as individuals taking the new Level IA course. He suggested that there be little change between the current course and the new Level IA course.

The Board continued to discuss the merits of preparing the examination before the curriculum for Level IA and how much the Level IA course should differ from the current NPDES one-day courses.

Mr. Teague recommended that the Board review the draft agenda for the Level IA course prepared by Dr. Shahlaee as a place to begin.

Dr. Shahlaee distributed the draft agenda stating that it is similar to the current NPDES one-day course agenda with some minor changes. The draft agenda has been attached to these minutes.

The Board began discussing the draft agenda by discussing how long should be spent covering the Erosion and Sediment Control Act of 1975.

Mr. Wetherington recommended that the Board not approve set times for each course section but talk about the outline of information to be covered. Mr. Easter stated that when teaching courses he does not stick strictly to an agenda if the group shows interest in a certain topic. Mr. Teague agreed that it would be better to review the course outline rather than talk about specific times. He stated that the target audience for the Level IA course would need to know how to implement the law and permits and how to stay out of trouble.

Dr. Shahlaee disagreed and the Board continued to discuss the issue.

Mr. Hamilton stated that it seemed to be the opinion of most Board members that too much time is devoted to the law on the draft agenda.

The Board continued to review the draft agenda by addressing the section relating to the NPDES Permits. Mr. Teague recommended cutting down the time devoted to reviewing the permits and Mr. Easter disagreed.

Mr. Magnus asked which permit would be taught, as they are all different. He added that DOT contractors would need to know more about the infrastructure permit. Mr. Easter stated that he currently reviews the stand-alone permit and the points out the differences between the stand-alone, infrastructure and common development permits. He stated that it is important to teach students how to use the material so that when they are back in the office or on the job site they can use the materials as a reference.

Mr. Hamilton summarized the discussion stating the Board seemed to agree that it would be important to teach enough about the law that attendees would learn enough in class that they would be able to reference the material in order to stay out of trouble.

The Board continued to review the draft agenda by addressing the section relating to the Vegetative Measures. Mr. Easter opened the discussion by stating that he agreed with the time allotted for vegetative measures but that it may be more than necessary. Mr. Magnus noted that the DOT uses more vegetative controls than anyone and the Worksite Erosion Control Supervisor courses did not allot as much time for vegetative controls. He stated that decisions related to vegetation were not made on the job site but by the plan designer. Mr. Gaskill stated that when teaching the Worksite Erosion Control Supervisory course he reviews the set specifications to adhere to and includes such BMPs as vegetated waterways.

The Board discussed having a Question and Answer period before lunch. Dr. Shahlaee stated that after 7-8 hours of instruction, individuals would be tested and therefore the agenda needs to allow time for review.

Mr. Easter asked if certain sections on the agenda are broken out such as, the NPDES permit section and recordkeeping, if instructors would be allowed to combine sections. Dr. Shahlaee stated that the Commission would provide PowerPoint presentations for instructors. Mr. Easter responded that he liked his presentations better.

The Board continued to review the draft agenda by addressing the section relating to the structural control measures. Mr. Hamilton opened the discussion by asking Mr. Magnus how DOT teaches the structural measures section of their course. Mr. Magnus stated that when the courses were approved in 2000, the Commission required 2 hours to be devoted to structural measures.

The Board discussed the merits of teaching the inspections section and NPDES permit requirement sections as one or splitting them up.

Mr. Teague asked the Board to remember their target audience. He stated that the Level IA class should be developed working off a base of a high school education. He asked that the Board focus on what material these individuals would be using on a day-to-day basis.

The Board continued to discuss structural measures and how to instruct on inspection requirements.

Mr. Hamilton asked the Board to refer to the Trainer/Instructor outline in the Stakeholder Advisory Board notebook.

The Board discussed the material associated with the "Erosion and Sedimentation Process, Factors and Impacts on the Environment."

Mr. Teague stated that feedback he has heard reflected that many individuals do not understand that concepts behind the erosion process.

Mr. Magnus advocated eliminating material associated with the Universal Soil Loss Equation. Dr. Shahlaee disagreed stating that the USLE can be used to illustrate the relationships involved in erosion and the importance of using vegetation as prevention.

The Board discussed the material associated with the "Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act of 1975." Mr. Ringer stated that this presentation could be shortened, as the contractor does not need to know about the relationship between the Local Issuing Authorities and the Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

Mr. Hamilton recognized Ms. Beall of the Council for Quality Growth. Ms. Beall stated that the target audience for Level IA would include primary permitted and those with increased liability. She stated that the agenda needed to cover the law and explain fully how to comply with the law.

Ms. Sleeth agreed. She stated that a lot of the detail relating to how the law came to its current point could be eliminated however, it would be important to cover the requirements in the law as well as stop work ordered.

Mr. Hamilton recommended the Board rank each component as to the level of importance. The Board discussed this option.

Mr. Hamilton recognized Mr. Gaskill (E&S Specialties, Inc). Mr. Gaskill recommended reducing time spend discussing the E&S Act to 30 minutes. He stated that it would be important to discuss new buffer requirements and that some people would be covered by the General Permit but not the E&S Act. He advocated including plans, inspections, sampling and reporting in the NPDES Permit section. He also recommended that individuals be able to ask questions during presentations instead of afterward.

The Board continued to discuss time limits for the presentations.

The Board discussed the material associated with the structural best management practices. Several members supported devoting the afternoon of the Level IA course to discussing vegetative and structural measures. Mr. Gaskill and Mr. Magnus again stated that in 2000 the

Commission required 2 hours be spent reviewing structural measures. Mr. Gaskill added that he felt an instructor would be deficient if he did not review every BMP.

The Board continued discussing structural measures.

Mr. Teague recommended going through the Train the Trainer outline to determine important elements of training.

Mr. Hamilton requested that Dr. Shahlaee prepare bullet points for the next meeting to outline what would be included in each section of the Level IA training. Dr. Shahlaee requested that Mr. Ringer prepare bullet points associated with the E&S Act section of the training.

The meeting adjourned with Mr. Hamilton reminding members that the January 19, 2005 meeting would be held in Covington.

Submitted by

Michaelyn Rozar