**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**
**August 29, 2012**
**Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission**
**Athens, GA**

**Those in attendance:**

Lauren Zdunczyk
Guerry Thomas
Ben Ruzowicz
Reece Parker
Jim Sloan
Joel Sprague – TRI Environmental
Jay Sprague – TRI Environmental
Davie Biagi
Adena Fullard
Marc Mastronardi
Britt Faucette
Brian Watson

Ms. Zdunczyk called the meeting to order. Executive Director Dykes briefly joined the meeting to thank the committee for their hard work. Ms. Zdunczyk introduced Mr. Joel Sprague from TRI Environmental. Mr. Sprague presented the draft report for the BMP testing. Committee members were given both paper and digital copies of the draft report.

Mr. Sprague presented a summary of the report:

WK11340 Mr. Mastronardi stated that the test results have validated the information that is currently in the Manual. Mr. Mastronardi also stated that the trapping capacity for non woven material is high. He asked at which point will it fail in the field and what maintenance will be required? The following example was given: The Manual suggests using rip rap check dams - on the first event lots of sediment passes through but with more use less passes through.

ASTM 7208 (modified) Dr. Faucette asked how the straw bales were installed. Mr. Jay Sprague explained that the bales were turned on their sides and buried six inches deep then behind that two additional bales with their meeting point being at the center of the row of bales are buried 8 inches down which creates a type of scouring pad. Mr. Sloan asked if the moisture content is always the same. Mr. Jay Sprague confirmed that it is. Mr. Parker stated that the purpose of a channel check is to slow velocity, not store sediment. Mr. Joel Sprague stated that this is the weakest part of the standard and that this would be a great topic to give his company feed back on. Mr. Ruzowicz asked what the difference was in the first and second installations of the check dams. Mr. Joel Sprague responded that the difference was in the compaction of the various areas as well as in the installation process. Mr. Mastronadi asked if the velocity reduction data was also captured. Mr. Joel Sprague confirmed that it was.

Conclusion and Recommendations: Recommended Revised Specifications – Mr. Parker asked what exactly the chart (Table 6) is showing – and asked if the numbers came straight from GDOT. Mr. Joel Sprague confirmed that the numbers did come from GDOT. Mr. Parker asked if the installation times in the report are true to what will happen in the field or in the lab environment. Mr. Joel Sprague stated that they report only the time it takes to set it up like it will be when in the field. Ms. Biagi asked how much disturbance is involved when the systems are removed. Mr. Mastronardi stated that he would like to know the results of the device when it has been in the field and undergone more than one rain event. He suggested that if there is a P (performance) factor to be drawn from the data, perhaps a correlation can be found to show how it performs after successive rain events. Mr. Watson agreed that there is a need for the ability to have a trend that could compare multiple events and/or devices. Mr. Joel Sprague stated that this can be done at his lab.

Mr. Parker stated the info in the report helps to create better maintenance requirements. The Committee then discussed having TRI perform multiple tests on materials and also test using multiple materials at once. Mr. Ruzowicz asked if maintenance would be done between tests. Mr. Mastronardi responded that the details in the manual would have to be looked at for this. Mr. Parker and Mr. Mastronardi agree that the test should be done with recommended maintenance. Ms. Zdunczyk stated that the initial idea was to establish benchmarks she expressed concern about requiring product companies to submit to more than the one test. Mr. Mastronardi explained that this is more for the design standards in the Manual and that the product companies will not have to pay for additional testing. Mr. Parker suggested that products that do not perform well when tested with multiple events may not be approved for inclusion in the Manual. Mr. Joel Sprague stated that the testing done thus far has provided a good base for testing new products. Ms. Fullard expressed concerned about how benchmarks will be set for alternative products or practices. Dr. Faucette stated that he thinks this is a good opportunity to further understand the performance of BMPs after multiple rain events and expressed concern that if the Committee changed its mind after the first test it will be difficult to hold the alternative products to standards. Mr. Sloan suggested focusing on flow rates. Mr. Mastronardi responded that this is an entirely different area of criteria and he doesn't think it would be possible. Mr. Sloan suggested focusing on flow rates. Mr. Mastronardi responded that this is an entirely different area of criteria and he doesn't think it would be possible. Mr. Parker and Mr. Mastronardi agreed that the goal is to find a benchmark on the products and practices currently listed in the Manual.
The Committee agreed that testing for multiple events is more for guidance in maintenance and design standards. The Committee discussed requiring multiple testing on new products – Mr. Parker and Mr. Watson agreed with this.

Mr. Mastronardi suggested using testing for multiple events to establish design criteria. Ms. Zdunczyk asked if this would also be required for new products. Mr. Thomas stated that he doesn't see the point in all the testing and that it goes against the initial intention. Ms. Zdunczyk asked if there are additional BMPs that should be tested. Mr. Ruzowicz suggested testing straw to set a C factor for matting and blankets & hydraulically applied

products. Mr. Sloan stated that he would like to see mulched straw tested. The Committee agreed to test straw with the specs for Ds3.

Ms. Zdunczyk will email Committee members regarding the next meeting date.