

TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING
REVISING THE MANUAL FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

Tuesday, October 28, 2014

Oconee County Civic Center

2661 Hog Mountain Road

Watkinsville, Georgia 30677

10:00 A.M.

Barbara Hilger, RPR

Certified Court Reporter, GA A-295

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 A P P E A R A N C E S

3 Brent Dykes, Executive Director, Georgia Soil and Water
Conservation Commission

4

5 Ben Ruzowicz, Interim Urban Program Manager, Georgia
Soil and Water Conservation Commission

6

7

8 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

9 Thomas Brown Betty Jean Jordan

Britt Faucette Bob Moran

10 Adena Fullard Reece Parker

Kirby Hamil Brian Watson

11 Joshua Escue

12

13 ADVISERS PRESENT:

14 Glen Behrend Guerry Thomas

Marc Mastronardi Eric Harris

15 Dewey Richardson David Eigenberg

16

17 PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

18 Robert Page

Donald Davis

19 Kelli Davis

20

21

22

23

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: We'd like to call the meeting to
3 order. Good morning and welcome to Watkinsville. We
4 appreciate the Watkinsville County Government allowing
5 us to use their civic center today. Appreciate all the
6 committee members being here today, and our technical
7 advisers, thank you for being here for the day.

8 My name is Brent Dykes. I'm the Executive
9 Director of the Georgia Soil and Water Commission. I'll
10 be moderating today's meeting. First I'd call your
11 attention as committee members to the agenda presented
12 before you, seven items as listed on the agenda
13 currently, ask you to review that and see if there would
14 be any changes or additions to the agenda.

15 (Pause)

16 Would anybody like to make a modification to
17 the agenda at this time?

18 Okay, seeing none, the agenda will stand as
19 presented.

20 Moving to Item 2, the review of the October
21 9th Technical Advisory Committee meeting, as committee
22 members and for the general public's knowledge, the
23 transcript as transcribed by our court reporter, who is

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 with us again today, has been posted to the Website, so
3 that is up for public review. It has been posted online
4 at our commission Website.

5 Brief review, as far as the meeting went from
6 the last time, as you'll remember we had a presentation
7 from Joel Sprague of TRI Environmental, his response to
8 the public comments that the committee had received at
9 the September 10th meeting which was held in Athens.
10 There was a good bit of discussion amongst the audience
11 and the TAC members. A presentation was given also at
12 that time. The TAC began a discussion on the need or
13 potential need for a third-party review of the best
14 management practice testing that was done. No official
15 action was taken but it was discussed. And a brief
16 discussion was held regarding the manual that would take
17 effect as of January 1 and any recommendations this
18 committee, the TAC, would like to give to the State
19 Conservation Commission Board.

20 That was a very long meeting. We will
21 anticipate hopefully our meeting today is not quite so
22 long, but we will certainly be here as long as public
23 comment takes us. At today's meeting public comment is

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Item 6. It will remain Item 6. It's our intent today,
3 or my intent as moderator, to allow the committee to
4 deliberate on the items on the agenda today, and we'll
5 hold public comment at the end of the day's agenda.

6 That's a brief summary of the last meeting on
7 October 9th. For your information as committee members
8 and the audience also, TRI has provided the commission
9 with the raw data that was used to generate the testing
10 that was done. That data will be posted today by
11 Website, if anybody has any interest in the data that
12 backs up or that was used to produce the full report
13 that we've all had comment on at this point. That
14 information will be posted online today at the Technical
15 Advisory Committee part of the commission's Website,
16 just to make you aware of that.

17 Any questions about the last meeting of
18 October the 9th? Hearing none, we'll move to Item 3,
19 consideration and discussion on the version and contents
20 of the Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in
21 Georgia as of January 1st, 2015. Just as a point of
22 reference for the committee before you begin your
23 deliberations, Georgia code requires that as of January

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 1 of each calendar year the manual in effect on that
3 date is the manual that will be used for that calendar
4 year. So we are a couple of months away from that date
5 and the possible chance of that resetting or being
6 different than what we currently have in place. We felt
7 it was very important for the industry and professionals
8 that design plans and those that are doing the work out
9 on the construction sites to have some certainty as to
10 what manual is in effect, and so today's discussion will
11 be centered on that. So I will open that topic up for
12 consideration, Item 3.

13 One thing I'll remind you of: The court
14 reporter does not need you to state your name at this
15 time. She's got you down pat from last meeting and she
16 can read your name tags. So just raise your hand to get
17 my attention if you want to be recognized and I'll
18 recognize you, but don't worry about having to restate
19 your name. So we are ready for discussion on the
20 potential version of the manual as of January 1, 2015.

21 (No response)

22 Okay. Nobody wants to start. I'll start, get
23 the discussion started. We provided with your agenda on

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the back of your agenda a stapled sheet, a summary of
3 revisions. It's available to those in the audience
4 also. This summary of revisions are the major changes
5 that were made between the 5th Edition of the manual and
6 the 6th Edition of the manual. Following up some of the
7 Technical Advisory Committee comments since the last
8 meeting, we thought it would be a good idea for you to
9 have a listing of the major changes, so that's what you
10 have before you, to know what changed predominantly
11 between the 5th Edition and 6th Edition. We thought
12 that might help you in your deliberation today.

13 MR. MORAN: On the P Factor, how was that set?
14 Why was it at .03 and .045?

15 MR. DYKES: How was it set and why was it set?
16 Ben, you want to take a stab at that?

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically with the P Factor all
18 the things we took, we tested, we took the lowest
19 product and basically -- well, the lowest product was
20 straw bales. The committee thought that we need to do
21 better than straw bales. And then the other one was in
22 the middle of all the products we tested, basically.

23 MR. MORAN: It was in the middle?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: The reason for that is because
3 in the past there was Types A, B, and C. How was Types
4 A, B, and C originally presented that they need to be
5 there, by flow rate, by different things. I don't know
6 the exact qualifications for how Type A, B, and C got
7 there, but there was already a standard that there was
8 different levels of sediment barriers, so the committee
9 felt that it would be good to go with a sensitive and a
10 nonsensitive being that a sediment barrier could
11 possibly be more than just the traditional type of silt
12 fence.

13 I mean, as far as where we're at, if you move
14 the numbers either way, it doesn't matter. The ultimate
15 thing that really matters is that we have a process to
16 allow new products to be in the manual. So where that
17 number falls, I don't have a problem with making it
18 straw bales, whatever you guys want to do. But we need
19 a way to allow new products into the manual for erosion
20 and sediment, regardless whether that's a silt fence
21 that tweaks something that they do or it's a whole
22 different kind of product that's out there that doesn't
23 meet your traditional geotextile type of silt fence.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MORAN: The way the manual would be
3 written, if I had a -- we'll use silt fence as an
4 example. If I had a new wonder silt fence, then I would
5 have to test it against 11340 to get it to show what the
6 P Factor was to get it approved.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: That's the way they had it in
8 the new one, right. I mean, if anybody on the committee
9 feels that I'm saying anything incorrectly from before,
10 then please speak up.

11 MR. MORAN: Well, I wasn't here.

12 MR. FAUCETTE: I would clarify that the
13 nonsensitive does include all the materials or products
14 that were tested except for straw bales, and the
15 sensitive does draw the line down the middle. You may
16 have known that but I just wanted to clarify.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: They had talked about adding a
18 plus or minus variability in it before. I'm fine with
19 that, but even if you have a plus or minus, there's
20 still going to be a minimum number for that plus or
21 minus either way that people are going to have to meet.

22 MR. HAMIL: I don't like the P Factor at all.
23 I think it should be replaced with percent silt

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 retained. That gives you a better idea of how the
3 things work. P Factors are numbers that are based off
4 charts that has various assumptions.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: I think Kirby has a good point.
6 Actually, the P Factor is actually based off of sediment
7 reduction or sediment removal efficiency, but I think
8 through this process we found it seems to be a difficult
9 calculation to understand, I think, in general how it's
10 created, and now there seems to be some debate as to how
11 you calculate that, as we've heard from Joel and Wes.
12 It's basically the same thing, but I think it's much
13 easier to understand to just use a straight, potentially
14 a straight sediment retention or sediment removal
15 efficiency.

16 MR. DYKES: Since we're talking about silt
17 fence and the P Factor particularly here, and that gets
18 down to Chapter 6, I'm going to make a suggestion. If
19 the committee disagrees, then certainly let's go in a
20 different direction. I'm going to suggest that we take
21 the list here and start chapter by chapter, and where
22 there is agreement, let's express agreement if the
23 committee feels such. If there's not agreement, then

11

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 let's express disagreement and discuss it. Otherwise
3 I'm not sure we're going to get through what edition of
4 the manual we have as of January 1 and we might be -- we
5 want to get into these discussions. These are very
6 important discussions, but we want to find if there's
7 any agreement. If there's not, we want to make that
8 known also. Let's do that. Is everybody okay with that
9 as a committee?

10 FROM THE FLOOR: Sure.

11 MR. DYKES: Let's start with Chapter 1, and as
12 you can see, minor changes have been made as far as
13 referring to the Georgia code, and the National
14 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits added
15 some guidance regarding minor land-disturbing activities
16 and maintenance and abandoned sites. Does any committee
17 member want to express any disagreement with Chapter 1
18 as edited? Seeing none, then Chapter 1 is agreed to.
19 Chapter 2 has been updated to include newly proposed
20 BMPs, and pictures were replaced. Ben, will you explain
21 a little bit what that means?

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: So basically the abbreviations
23 for some of the BMPs have changed, so where before we

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 had just matting and blanket, we are now changed to
3 slope stabilization so that it could incorporate
4 whatever other kind of product somebody could come up
5 with they wanted to use to stabilize a slope, slope
6 stabilization being more of a general term than just
7 matting and blanket. All the new BMPs that have been
8 added, the skimmers, seep berms, Sd4s, turbidity curb
9 and tree protection, flocculants and coagulants, so all
10 those, and then the sensitive and nonsensitive for the
11 sediment barriers, were put in there because they have a
12 breakdown of each individual BMP in Chapter 6 by
13 paragraph, in paragraph form. So it's just an overview
14 basically of Chapter 6. So if one of the BMPs in
15 Chapter 6 were to change or an abbreviation were to
16 change, then that -- it doesn't go back and give full
17 blown details like the individual section; it's just a
18 brief overview of what it is.

19 MR. DYKES: Why don't we hold off on Chapter 2
20 since 2 is connected to 6, from a general standpoint as
21 far as symbols. Anybody want to disagree with that on
22 the committee?

23 MR. BROWN: I don't know if symbols are going

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 to change anything according to that. I mean,
3 everything based upon Chapter 6 is regarding performance
4 data, it's not based upon symbols, so I think Chapter 2
5 needs to be approved and we need to go forward with
6 Chapter 3.

7 MR. WATSON: I agree.

8 MR. DYKES: Mr. Brown says let's move forward.
9 Mr. Watson agrees. Is there any disagreement with
10 leaving Chapter 2 as presented?

11 MR. BEHREND: Does leaving Chapter 2 as
12 presented create any confusion if there were a change in
13 the edition?

14 MR. DYKES: By change in edition, you mean
15 change to Chapter 6?

16 MR. BEHREND: Since the 6th Edition has the
17 new nomenclature, if Chapter 2 is kept as is with the
18 6th Edition and there were changes in the 6th Edition,
19 does that create confusion? Wouldn't it be simpler to
20 go back to the 5th Edition?

21 MR. DYKES: Glen's question is should we go
22 back to the nomenclature in the 5th Edition, basically,
23 for committee discussion.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: No. I think we should go with the
3 new Edition 6.

4 MR. DYKES: So you like the symbols in the
5 6th, Mr. Hamil.

6 MS. JORDAN: I agree. We're talking what we
7 like about the 6th Edition and --

8 MR. DYKES: Or dislike, either way.

9 MS. JORDON: Right. So assuming we're
10 sticking with the 6th Edition, we need to use the 6th
11 Edition symbols.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'd just like to say, if
13 something were to change in one of the other sections,
14 for future discussion, whatever that was, if it were to
15 change, then it would have to be changed here. As you
16 go along all those BMPs on the row when you get to
17 Chapter 6, as long as they don't change or whatever,
18 then you wouldn't need to revise the section.

19 MR. PARKER: But we don't know what we're
20 going to decide.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. I think all the new
22 BMPs are a good thing for people to be able to use
23 because it gives people more option of what to pick for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 their designs, but I don't know what's going to become
3 of Chapter 6.

4 MR. BROWN: I don't think anything is going to
5 be removed as far as what the labeling is in Chapter 6.
6 I think it's just going to be based on what your P
7 Factor is and everything else. So I think really, as
8 long as these are changed, I mean, that's just going to
9 be how each item is identified. It's not pass or fail
10 on an item.

11 MR. PARKER: I think you're probably right,
12 but there's a slight chance that we may get into a deep
13 discussion and decide to change something that would
14 affect it. So I'd like to propose that we hold off
15 because then that would preclude us from changing
16 anything as far as the symbols when we get to the
17 discussion of Chapter 6.

18 MS. FULLARD: Ben, could you tell us exactly
19 where it talked about the sensitive and nonsensitive
20 area in Chapter 2? I don't see it in here at all. It's
21 just got Sd1.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm sorry.

23 MS. FULLARD: And honestly, we have the slope

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 stabilization, the new SS, we have the flocc, so I don't
3 think this is going to change if we were to change
4 performance standards in 6, Chapter 2. And if we made
5 some changes to any of Chapter 6, those revisions would
6 need to be looked at throughout the chapters. So I
7 think we're just agreeing to using the new symbols, not
8 necessarily the practices that go along with that. I
9 didn't see it anywhere in there. I didn't bring my red
10 line changes.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: I must have been mistaken. I
12 was just going off what I knew was new in each section.

13 MR. PARKER: That's even more reason that I
14 agree that we can approve, if none of the
15 performance-based ones that are under discussion right
16 now are in the 6th. I'm okay with it.

17 MR. DYKES: As moderator, what I will do is I
18 will go chapter by chapter. We'll make agreement and
19 disagreement as we go through. At the end I'll give you
20 an opportunity to edit your comment to Chapter 2. I
21 will come back to that. I didn't state that at the
22 beginning because there are things that are linked
23 together. So if that gives you comfort to know you have

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 another opportunity on the full manual to make a comment
3 or propose a change, certainly I'll come back. On
4 Chapter 2 do I hear agreement to leave it as is or
5 change?

6 MR. PARKER: Leave it as is.

7 MR. DYKES: Anybody that wants to make a
8 change? Okay. Agreed as is. Chapter 3, we revised the
9 existing information and added two new sections as far
10 as coordinating post-construction stormwater management,
11 added a section on low-impact development, and updated
12 information related to Georgia law and the National
13 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits.
14 Comments, questions, on Chapter 3?

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: There was a public comment made
16 on this chapter as far as referencing a specific product
17 in one of the plans. They put it in there as an
18 example, so that's something we could just take off so
19 that no specific product is referenced in the set of
20 plans that we have as an example. If somebody chooses
21 to do that on their own plans, that's their own choice,
22 but in that case we won't have an example. I know that
23 was a public comment.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. BROWN: Where is that at, Ben?

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: If you look at the detail in
4 one of the phase plans in your manual on the new plans.
5 It's Phase 1 or Phase 2. No, no. It's in the layout of
6 the design of the -- it's really small. Drawing 3.

7 MR. BROWN: It's on Drawing 4 as well.

8 MR. WATSON: The comment was to remove the
9 manufacturer?

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: Well, that was the comment,
11 yeah. I'm just going off what I remember.

12 MR. FAUCETTE: Does it mention a product or
13 the actual manufacturer?

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: It gives the manufacturer's
15 name, right.

16 MR. WATSON: I think that should be removed.

17 MR. FAUCETTE: I agree.

18 MR. DYKES: That was an oversight, obviously.

19 MR. BROWN: It's on Sheet 3 and 4.

20 MR. DYKES: Outside of that one change that
21 I've heard to this point on Chapter 3, are there other
22 changes you would propose regarding Chapter 3? Hearing
23 none, is there agreement other than the one edit to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Sheet 3 and 4 of the plan? I see agreement. We'll make
3 the one noted change on Chapter 3.

4 Chapter 4, minor revisions were made to
5 outdated information. Is there any comments regarding
6 Chapter 4? If any of the committee members or advisers
7 need a manual, we have manuals. Why don't we do that.
8 When we get into 6, I'm sure you're going to need one.

9 MS. JORDAN: I don't see any problem with
10 approving Chapter 4 as is.

11 MR. DYKES: We'll pause just a moment to be
12 sure you have a manual.

13 MR. WATSON: I agree with Chapter 4.

14 (Pause)

15 MR. DYKES: I'll draw your attention back to
16 Chapter 4. Any proposed changes to Chapter 4? Seeing
17 none, Chapter 4 is agreed to. Chapter 5 is the contact
18 information chapter regarding sources of information and
19 assistance to those in the erosion control industry,
20 various state and federal offices, and information
21 that's been updated regarding contact numbers, district
22 maps, area maps, things of that nature.

23 MR. WATSON: Glen, has the EPD address

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 changed?

3 MR. BEHREND: Yeah, we ought to change that.

4 MR. WATSON: The Georgia EPD needs to change
5 down to 1 Martin Luther King. The address needs to
6 change.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: This was printed to the time
8 now. EPD has moved offices from their former location
9 to Atlanta.

10 MR. DYKES: That's on Page 1 of Chapter 5.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: 5-1, yeah.

12 MS. JORDAN: I did happen to see a typo on the
13 Corps of Engineers map, coastal office in the Piedmont,
14 and Piedmont is a misspelling. But otherwise I think
15 it's very helpful to have all these maps in one chapter
16 together.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: That was Page 5-9?

18 MS. JORDAN: Correct.

19 MR. DYKES: Other changes to Chapter 5?

20 Hearing none, is there agreement that Chapter 5 be
21 updated with the EPD address being changed and the
22 correct spelling of Piedmont? Okay. I see agreement.

23 Chapter 6, in general this was the chapter

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that had the most changes. The suggestion has been made
3 that we do the appendices first and then go back to
4 Chapter 6 because we're going to spend a lot of time on
5 Chapter 6 and may not get to the appendices if we don't
6 take care of them now. Does the committee disagree with
7 that?

8 FROM THE FLOOR: No.

9 MR. DYKES: Okay. Let's move to Appendix A,
10 which is the first tab behind Chapter 6. Appendix A was
11 updated per guidance we received from the U.S.
12 Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation
13 Service regarding runoff and the tools that can be used,
14 computer tools and other tools that can be used to
15 determine runoff. Questions or comments regarding
16 Appendix A?

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: So in the old appendix it was
18 Appendix A-1, A-2. They were all combined into one
19 appendix through this revision by the NRCS.

20 MR. DYKES: Okay. Hearing no comment, then
21 Appendix A is agreed to. Appendix B-1 regarding soil
22 series interpretation also was updated per information
23 provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Resource Conservation Service, soil properties, soil
3 maps, things of that nature. Anybody want to express a
4 comment on that? Eric, looks like you passed.

5 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I'll give our guys some
6 props. The entire state is now complete for the first
7 time ever.

8 MR. DYKES: Eric Harris has joined us today
9 from the Natural Resource Conservation Service. So
10 Appendix B-1 stands approved. Appendix B-2 is
11 estimating soil erosion using the revised Universal Soil
12 Loss Equation.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: I believe there is a public
14 comment on this one as well, wanting to go back to the
15 Universal Soil Loss Equation.

16 MR. DYKES: Thank you for raising that
17 comment, Ben.

18 FROM THE FLOOR: What was it, Ben?

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: That we go back to the
20 Universal Soil Loss Equation, I believe.

21 MR. DYKES: Comments or changes proposed to
22 Appendix B-2? Any comments? Seeing none, it's agreed
23 to, Appendix B-2.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Appendix C was not changed from the prior
3 manual to this manual. That might be the only thing
4 that didn't change. Anybody want to propose a change to
5 Appendix C? It's regarding riprap. Okay. Seeing no
6 comment, Appendix C is approved as is.

7 Appendix D, the change there was, instead of
8 having the printed model ordinance for the Soil Erosion
9 Sedimentation Act for counties and cities to use to be a
10 local issuing authority, now there's a link, so that as
11 that is updated, the manual doesn't have to change, you
12 can just go to the Website. Does anybody want to
13 propose a change to Appendix D? It stands approved then
14 as presented.

15 Appendix E, conversion factors, no change from
16 the 5th Edition to the 6th Edition. Would anybody like
17 to propose a change? Seeing none, it's agreed to.

18 Appendix F, a glossary of terms that were used
19 throughout the manual. It was updated based on
20 terminology that was added throughout the manual. Any
21 proposed changes for Appendix F? Seeing none, it's
22 agreed to.

23 The last item before Chapter 6 would be

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 references, and those are references as coded throughout
3 the manual to this point. Certainly, if changes have
4 been made, we'd have to update the reference. Any
5 proposed changes for references? I see none, so let's
6 go back to Chapter 6, which happens to be the largest
7 chapter.

8 MR. HARRIS: I hate to do this, but I do have
9 a comment on Appendix D. Should I hold onto it?

10 MR. DYKES: No. Go ahead.

11 MR. HARRIS: On Page C-5, the curve and the
12 size of your riprap I've had several calls from
13 consultants that a lot of municipalities require this
14 chart be filled out and turned in during plan review,
15 and a lot of people have no idea how to use this. Just
16 a very small amount of explanation of this chart and how
17 to use it may be a good idea.

18 MR. DYKES: So some additional terminology
19 that allows better usage.

20 MR. HARRIS: Just a little bit of detail.
21 I've had to answer velocity of what. Of course, we know
22 what it is, but on this chart I've had several
23 questions. Just explain the axes on this chart.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: Okay. So the comment is maybe
3 add some terminology that allows better use for the
4 chart, not changing the curve, not changing the
5 information that's provided, but allowing for better
6 usage of it. Any comments or disagreement from the
7 committee regarding that?

8 MR. BROWN: That's Table C-5.

9 MR. RUZOWICZ: Marc, this one, C-5, is this
10 still what the DOT is using?

11 MR. MASTRONARDI: For riprap selection?

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes. Or have you guys updated
13 your stuff?

14 MR. MASTRONARDI: Well, I think part of it is
15 still going to be, still is a nomograph, but then the
16 other part is the research we did at Tech for ditch
17 protection. So we have software that we run. We still
18 can align with this.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay.

20 MR. DYKES: Okay. Is there agreement on the
21 committee to add some terminology for greater use? And
22 we'll work with NRCS on that and make that available for
23 better usage. Okay, that's agreed to, one change to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Appendix C.

3 Now going back to Chapter 6, in general many
4 details were changed here along with drawings were
5 redone and certainly pictures have been replaced with
6 updated pictures in general. You see there on the
7 bottom of the first page of your summary of revisions
8 some major revisions as it relates to specific best
9 management practices for BMPs. Just going down the
10 sheet, and certainly not precluding any committee member
11 from making a comment, but to move forward, the first
12 major revision was removal of matting and blanket and
13 replaced with slope stabilization. That would be on
14 Page 6-121.

15 MS. JORDAN: As far as I know there haven't
16 been any concerns about performance factors for slope
17 stabilization. Is that correct?

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: There's some comments in your
19 comments packet from American Excelsior Company. And
20 they would like to see it split into two different
21 categories so that there's a sensitive and a
22 nonsensitive application for slope stabilization.

23 MR. FAUCETTE: Ben, can you direct us to the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 actual comment, where that is?

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: So Page 3 of their comments:

4 What is the threshold of maximum C based on? Basically

5 that number came from tackified straw to a slope. That

6 was the original recommendation, that if something

7 couldn't do as good as tackified straw to a slope, on a

8 three-to-one slope, then it shouldn't basically be used.

9 Then they recommend setting the maximum C Factor at .03

10 for sensitive areas and .10 for nonsensitive areas,

11 which is still a 90 percent effectiveness.

12 MR. DYKES: Ben, now currently is there two

13 categories under this?

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: No, right now there are not two

15 categories for this. It's just one. I'm sorry. I'm

16 reading the wrong one. No. That's correct.

17 MR. PARKER: Number 4 under comments does

18 apply to the slope stabilization, but then the P Factor

19 comment is applied to sediment barriers.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. They are asking for the C

21 Factor there, top of the next page.

22 MR. PARKER: For the C, that's true, .03.

23 MR. DYKES: So for clarity for new committee

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 members and certainly the audience, from a performance
3 standpoint, criteria were added to slope stabilization.
4 Then what test or method is being used, Ben, if you
5 don't mind?

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: ASTM 6459. It was an existing
7 ASTM that the committee decided to go with. It's
8 already being run by a bunch of different people at a
9 bunch of different testing laboratories, and IECA has
10 stuff on their Website as well. No changes were
11 traditionally made to what we were just using, what was
12 already done by the industry, so that we could allow
13 other products besides just matting and blanket, maybe
14 like hydraulically applied stuff, anything else that
15 somebody else can come up with to use on a slope.

16 MR. PARKER: So that was their comment for the
17 performance, and then they also had comments regarding
18 the stitch spacing and density.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah, they have a lot of other
20 comments as well there as far as --

21 MR. PARKER: Slope stabilization.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah.

23 MR. BROWN: Ben, do you think it's worth

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 adding sensitive and nonsensitive qualifications since
3 we just have a basic C Factor maximum of .08?

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think that really would be up
5 to the committee's recommendation as far as what they
6 want to do. I don't know as far as -- in the past, I
7 don't know if Marc has any other information that the
8 DOT does anything differently, but we just had matting
9 and blanket. We didn't have it separated in different
10 categories. I don't know if DOT has it separated into
11 different categories for slope stabilization or not. So
12 before we were trying to stay with it, but if other
13 categories are going to have stuff like that, I don't
14 know.

15 MR. MASTRONARDI: No. We don't have that
16 separated out.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: How would you determine the
18 sensitive area number? Because everybody's always
19 saying what we already picked is arbitrary. So how are
20 you going to set that number? I don't think many people
21 are going to argue about tackified straw, that they
22 should be able to do better than tackified straw.

23 MR. PARKER: If we went with the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 recommendation, we would be lowering the performance
3 threshold to below what was previously used.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: At that .10, correct.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: It would only be based on one
6 person's recommendation as well; whereas, the previous
7 value, the previous committee talked about and came up
8 with a criteria as to why that should be.

9 MR. DYKES: What's the committee's feelings?

10 MR. MORAN: What I get from this letter here,
11 the way it's written, you eliminate Excelsior blankets;
12 right?

13 THE FLOOR: Green Book.

14 MR. MORAN: I'm sorry. Green Book.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: Eliminate it?

16 MR. MORAN: They're not listed. It says
17 specifically straw blankets, et cetera, et cetera. But
18 what he's saying in the letter here he eliminated the
19 Excelsior blanket erosion control material.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: These were supposed to be
21 generic specifications with no shalls next to them. The
22 only shall that was in there was the blanket shall be
23 nontoxic vegetation, seed, or wildlife products, shall

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 be determined to be nontoxic in accordance with the EPA.

3 Other than that, if somebody were to change something,

4 as long as they met that minimum criteria, these were

5 just general things for them to follow. We could add

6 another category if we needed to or revise the existing

7 categories, if that's what's needed. These were all

8 recommendations from before.

9 MR. HAMIL: I suggest we leave it as it is.

10 If we had to come up with a different number, we would

11 be arguing six months from now, so leave it as it is.

12 MR. DYKES: Mr. Hamil's recommendation is

13 leave it as it is. Is there any disagreement to leaving

14 the slope stabilization as it is using an ASTM and C

15 Factor of .08?

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: The first C Factor was .75, and

17 it went back to incorporate terminal velocity because

18 they did a recalculation on that through all the tests.

19 So that's why the number, from what originally came out

20 to now, went from .75 to .08.

21 MR. PARKER: I'm fine with leaving the

22 performance the way it is, but I think we ought to look

23 at some of their other comments.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MORAN: I don't have any problem with
3 performance, but if you read this, the only thing that's
4 accepted was the straw blanket. Is that what the DOT
5 has too?

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: No. We use a variety of
7 things on our slopes.

8 MR. DYKES: There seems to be agreement then
9 on the C Factor of .08 and the existing ASTM D 6459, so
10 now we're considering other changes.

11 MR. PARKER: Their first comment is about
12 removing specifications for stitch spacing density, and
13 their point is that that shouldn't matter if it meets
14 performance requirements. It should be based on the
15 performance and not on the way it's constructed. That
16 makes sense to me.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay.

18 MS. JORDAN: Is he saying that their product
19 is being excluded because their stitch spacing is larger
20 than what's specified here? Is that what's throwing
21 them out?

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. Anyplace there is a
23 shall, except for the other thing, we could put it to a

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 should, and then that way, if it's outside the box, it
3 doesn't matter. As far as changing the write-up, I'm
4 fine with however you guys want to change it.

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: I would just like to say I
6 agree with Reece, the idea being, if someone creates a
7 new product that meets that ASTM, whatever it looks like
8 and however it's constructed, if it performs, we should
9 all be happy with that.

10 MR. WATSON: As long as it's installed
11 correctly, I agree.

12 MS. JORDAN: It sounds like changing the
13 shalls to shoulds on the spacing and stitching
14 requirements would be an easy way to handle that.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: That way, if something does
16 fall outside of it, it won't be a problem.

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: I would just caution where
18 we have toxicity shalls, you keep those.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right, yes.

20 MR. FAUCETTE: I support that too. I think
21 the original intent behind the performance criteria was
22 to induce innovation and higher performance and not
23 restrict that moving forward, so I support that too.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: So change them all to should
3 except for the toxicity requirements.

4 MR. DYKES: Committee members agreeable to
5 that change? Okay. Other changes to slope
6 stabilization that would be proposed at this time? Any
7 other discussion on slope stabilization at this time?
8 I'm going to go to Reece. Looks like he's in deep
9 thought. I don't want to overlook him.

10 MR. PARKER: It looks like the way it's
11 currently written we were really drawing a box around
12 what these different products have to be.

13 MR. FAUCETTE: Materials.

14 MR. PARKER: The materials. Kind of goes back
15 to what I was saying earlier, my previous comment. But
16 that opens up a whole other thought, which is the
17 longevity, and I think I've been on one side of the
18 spectrum this whole process about longevity. I've
19 always thought that longevity is not important for us to
20 try to control, and here we are trying to put limits
21 around longevity. I guess I just have a problem with
22 that in general, but I've been overridden by the
23 committee for sure on that.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. FAUCETTE: Ben, can you refresh our memory
3 here? Were these taken from another source, ECTC or --

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think they were but I'd have
5 to go back and look it up to be a hundred percent sure
6 exactly where it came from.

7 MR. PARKER: My understanding is we are
8 talking about longevity, so that when somebody defines
9 this product and it's specified and inspected and all
10 stakeholders are involved, we're going to expect it to
11 last a certain amount of time. And I understand that.
12 It's got a lot of merit. But that cuts down on the
13 ability for the designer to specify a product that
14 doesn't need to last for months and months on end if
15 it's a project that might only have a few week duration
16 or a month duration. So my thought is leaving it up to
17 the designer and the pro at the local issuing
18 authorities to better define products that are used in
19 the field, to give flexibility to use less expensive
20 products, and when needed to use more expensive, longer
21 lasting products. If you don't want to have to keep
22 replacing it over and over, a product, then put in a
23 tougher piece of product. But for us to define it,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that's my issue with it, for the people that haven't
3 been on the committee.

4 MR. MASTRONARDI: Let me suggest this: I
5 think as I look at it, we're saying that's the
6 categorization of those various products based on how
7 the netting will hold up and how long before it
8 degrades. There isn't an assumption that we're actually
9 expecting that these products have to meet that
10 performance period and would somehow be tested for such
11 a period. I mean, the ASTM test is not that. I don't
12 know that this is bad in terms of the information, but
13 maybe it's in terms of presentation that it ought to be
14 for the designer's information only. Again, as far as
15 categorization goes, I don't think it does anything to
16 detract from the ASTM testing. I think the testing
17 gives whatever result it gets. I think we are probably
18 getting wrapped around the axle in terms of where we do
19 say functional longevity is, 24 months, 36 months. If
20 I'm the designer -- and you're right, Reece. I would
21 tend to agree with you -- I'm going to look at my
22 individual project and make that decision based on
23 needs.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. PARKER: And I guess you're right. These
3 are more guidelines. You don't have to specify on the
4 plan whether you're using an extensive term or not.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: The fact that we're talking
6 about it right now probably means there's a little bit
7 of confusion around it. So does it make sense to have a
8 note in there that these are just recommendations?

9 MR. MASTRONARDI: Or is the question -- I
10 mean, we have a definition of the standard of the BMP at
11 the top, but are these, is it better to say these are
12 working definitions or something of that nature that
13 just let's the designer know? Designer considerations
14 or something that spells it out, not to be confused with
15 an enforceable regulatory product that you have
16 mandated.

17 MR. PARKER: Well, it says planning
18 considerations right there, if I would have read it.

19 MR. MASTRONARDI: Fair enough.

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Dewey just pointed out to me
21 too that there is a line that actually says that.

22 MR. PARKER: Okay. Thanks for my education.

23 MR. DYKES: Any other discussion on slope

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 stabilization?

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: So the shalls to should.

4 MR. BEHREND: If I may ask a question, does
5 the shalls to should address the commentor's question
6 and concern, or is the committee intentionally not
7 taking the commentor's concern, or is it -- just could
8 we expand on what --

9 MS. JORDAN: That's why I made that
10 suggestion, because it sounds like his concern is he's
11 got a product that would meet the performance criteria
12 but the spacing happens to be bigger, and so by changing
13 it from shall to should, it would still allow that
14 product that meets performance criteria.

15 MR. BEHREND: Would the comments you have be a
16 concern about implied endorsement by having one product
17 or this particular, the Aspen Excelsior, not specified
18 in here as the example? Would that be a concern?

19 MS. JORDAN: They would have to go through the
20 process of getting to be an approved BMP, just to meet
21 the performance criteria, and then they'd be on the list
22 of approved BMPs.

23 MR. FAUCETTE: Glen, are you saying that we

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 either need to exclude mention of the material or expand
3 the types of materials described?

4 MR. BEHREND: I think that's what the comment
5 is. I'm just making sure we're completely addressing
6 it.

7 MS. FULLARD: The only issue I would have with
8 that is that in the planning considerations, if you read
9 the last statement, it says two general types of slope
10 stabilization products are discussed within this
11 specification, so it's not all inclusive. These are
12 just two of the more common. If there is another
13 product that's out there that would fall into the slope
14 stabilization category, we can't place -- this is
15 specifically talking about a roll product, so it's going
16 to have specific criteria for that product, same as the
17 hydraulic spread. Unless we're going to continue to
18 expand the slope stabilization BMP to include some
19 blankets and other type products, I don't know that we
20 could really -- again, it just says two general
21 products. It doesn't say specifically these are the two
22 products that a designer has to use. I don't know that
23 that would be -- I think it would create more confusion.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 That's just my opinion. It just leaves it a little bit
3 more general, to me.

4 MR. MORAN: To make it completely generic,
5 there's a comment here on the last page which is -- I'm
6 a member of the ECTC so I understand what he's talking
7 about here, and that is you could use that table and you
8 take that table, if this is it, and you set it down
9 right here over your materials, short-term, and so
10 forth, and you eliminate all the generic. Straw blanket
11 as a generic becomes just if your blanket meets
12 short-term, medium-term, long-term, whatever the case
13 may be, you can pick it. It can be any blanket as long
14 as it meets that. You can just take that table and just
15 lift it and set it right down on here and eliminate all
16 the problems he's got right here as far as Excelsior
17 blanket or straw blanket or something made out of
18 whatever, recycled tires, whatever the case may be.
19 You'd eliminate a lot of the conversation we're having
20 now.

21 MR. WATSON: This is just for consideration:
22 Could you remove the word "straw" and get away with just
23 "blanket," because then you could --

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MORAN: You could, but you would also have
3 construction type built in here too, and that table
4 doesn't have a construction type.

5 MR. WATSON: The only reason I say that is
6 because each of the starting paragraphs say straw
7 blanket, and then you go down further and it just says
8 "the blanket," so technically I think you could get away
9 with just putting blanket there knowing what you're
10 referring to. And then you go down to extended term,
11 the second paragraph under biodegradable starts with
12 blankets. It doesn't stay straw. When you get to the
13 long-term, it just says blankets.

14 MR. BROWN: The only place it shows straw is
15 in short-term.

16 MR. FAUCETTE: It does say the percentage of
17 straw under extended term.

18 MR. MORAN: That's an option to use. You can
19 take it out or just use that table, either way.

20 MR. DYKES: How would the committee like to
21 proceed?

22 MR. WATSON: I'm good with leaving as is.

23 MR. DYKES: Any other changes?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. PARKER: That means leaving the shall?

3 MR. WATSON: Yeah, with going from shall to
4 should.

5 MR. PARKER: I agree.

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Except for the toxicity
7 requirements.

8 MR. MASTRONARDI: Let me make mention that we
9 have included typical installation guidelines for our
10 ECPs. We may need to actually have a sentence in there:
11 "Or as per manufacturer guidance," because if the life
12 of this manual comes near the past version, we are going
13 to be into the future with somebody with something novel
14 that we'll be inspecting based on irrelevant guidelines.

15 MR. PARKER: That's a good point.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: In what section?

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: At 6-123 I would add, "Or
18 per manufacturer's installation."

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: Under the note?

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: Yeah.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: So add a number seven?

22 MR. MASTRONARDI: That would be fine. I think
23 if I were in my partner's shoes with DNR, I would want

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 to have something to inspect by.

3 MR. PARKER: That only addresses the rolled
4 products. That wouldn't address the hydraulic.

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right, which I don't think
6 we should try to speak to the hydraulically applied
7 other than those performance metrics.

8 MR. PARKER: Ben, doesn't this manual
9 somewhere say that these performance-based products have
10 to be installed per the way they were installed when
11 they were tested? Where is that articulated?

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: What it has for each BMP.
13 Guerry, is there something else you can think of?

14 MR. THOMAS: No.

15 MS. FULLARD: Would that not circle back
16 around to the ASTM testing? It's got to have some type
17 of installation, right?

18 MR. PARKER: It says per --

19 MS. FULLARD: Yeah, in testing method. I
20 don't think they were arguing with the testing method.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: Nobody brought up any questions
22 about that specific testing method itself.

23 MR. WATSON: I thought we talked during the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 last three-year cycle that any product that was new,
3 that type of language was going to be put in here that
4 that new product had to be installed per manufacturer's
5 specifications and that that had to be provided even
6 though it was an accepted, or even though it met all the
7 performance criteria, that it still had to be provided
8 in the plans. I know we're going back a couple years,
9 but that's a good question. If it's not mentioned in
10 here, I thought we did discuss it.

11 MR. DYKES: As part of each plan.

12 MR. WATSON: If it's not something that was a
13 traditional or standard BMP -- and this is all of them,
14 not just under slope stabilization, that if it's a
15 product that is a new product, that there was someplace
16 in here in the Green Book that said all products have to
17 be installed per manufacturer's specifications. And
18 then if it is a new product, that those specifications
19 had to be provided as part of the plans, so that it was
20 always there so you could just see it.

21 MR. RICHARDSON: It does mention that under
22 criteria. It says, "Installation and stapling of RECPs
23 and application rates of the ATCPs shall conform to the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 manufacturer's guidelines for application."

3 MR. WATSON: Thank you.

4 MR. DYKES: Any other comments on slope
5 stabilization?

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: So the specific note that we
7 are adding to Number 7 is "Or per manufacturer's
8 recommendations"?

9 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

10 MR. PARKER: To your comment, that is only the
11 rolled and hydraulically applied products, and we're
12 saying there could be other types.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: There could be anything. I
14 don't know what people are going to think of. I don't
15 know if somebody could come up with another way.

16 MR. PARKER: It's almost like we could lift
17 that note to a higher level and say anything used as a
18 slope stabilization BMP has to be installed the same way
19 it was installed when it was tested for performance. I
20 think that's a key thing. Manufacturer's recommendation
21 has got to match, or the way it was tested is the
22 manufacturer's recommended method. And who documents
23 that? My understanding is it's being documented by TRI.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 It's been documented by TRI. It would be documented by
3 the testing agent that's used for performance testing.
4 And then those test results would be accompanied with an
5 installation method, and that becomes the approved
6 method for installation. I think we just need to
7 articulate that on each one of these performance-based
8 BMPs at a high level, at a general level.

9 MR. DYKES: I think that's a note we can add
10 if it's not added. It makes sense for that to be
11 included. A comment has been made that on Page 65 of
12 Chapter 6 and on Page 129 we can make a general
13 statement that covers the vegetative and structural
14 measures, add that to the general section of each one,
15 and then that covers the vegetative BMPs and structural
16 BMPs, the comment that Mr. Parker has brought up. That
17 way it's not unintentionally left out of a section.
18 It's in every section.

19 MR. PARKER: I like that.

20 MR. DYKES: Other comments or questions or
21 concerns regarding slope stabilization? Hearing none,
22 under major revisions -- I'm sorry.

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: Can we go down the list

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 starting like in Section 1 in the chapter and go down
3 the BMPs the way it is? Because I don't think there's
4 going to be problems with some of these other ones that
5 didn't have any changes to them that might not take up a
6 lot of time.

7 MR. DYKES: I prefer to stay with this.
8 Polyacrylamide, major revision number two, is no longer
9 a stand-alone BMP. It can be found in
10 flocculants/coagulants and tackifiers. I guess the
11 point of consideration for the committee is should it
12 have its own section or are you okay with it having been
13 moved. Anybody want it to be changed back to its own
14 section from the committee's standpoint? Seeing none,
15 major revision two is agreed to.

16 Then we move to tackifiers and binders. The
17 code has been changed, and that's in Section C-125. Any
18 changes or revisions to tackifiers and binders? Seeing
19 none, it's agreed to.

20 Major revision four, revised checkdams and
21 added performance criteria. Checkdams are on Page
22 6-131.

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the comments that we got

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 is that straw bales should not be an option as
3 checkdams. They have been removed from states across
4 the country because they simply do not perform.

5 MR. BROWN: I disagree. If they are installed
6 properly, they'll do what they need to do.

7 MR. DYKES: Other comments on straw bale
8 checkdams?

9 MR. FAUCETTE: I think the testing showed that
10 the previous, the old installation method did not
11 perform well, but the NRCS version did.

12 MR. DYKES: Ben, for the committee's
13 consideration, detail the performance criteria and test
14 that was used so we can be reminded.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: So the group had decided to go
16 with an existing ASTM, 7208, which they modified to use
17 a clay soil, reducing the flow amounts to .5, 1, and 2
18 CFS, running those three different flows. From that
19 they took a recommendation within 20 percent of control.
20 I believe that's what it was. And also that it didn't
21 have a blowout. There's been questions as to what's
22 defined as a blowout, so one of the things we could do
23 is not even specify a blowout since it's not defined

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 anywhere, not even specify if something blows out or
3 not, just take into account what the difference is
4 between the control and whatever the amount is we
5 specify. There's also been a recalculation done, and I
6 believe that was for the wetted area of the slope, which
7 changed some of the numbers, which also changed the
8 recommendation that came to us to 30 percent of control.
9 There's also been some concerns brought up that we
10 tested the compost filter sock and it wasn't installed
11 properly per specification. I'm just trying to recap
12 everything on the whole, if I've missed anything.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: I would only add the
14 department's comments from the previous meeting
15 regarding installation for our test as well.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: I would say since there's
17 controversy around the W pattern silt fence, the compost
18 sock, leave those two out of what we're looking at,
19 nothing against anybody's stuff, and go with the straw
20 and rock that we already have. And anybody that wants
21 to come back and retest, just be within so much of
22 whatever the control is that you guys decide. I don't
23 know if that's what you guys want or whatever, but maybe

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that's a way to go about it. There was one other thing,
3 the shape of the channel that we had. Somebody had said
4 it wasn't a real-life shape of a channel.

5 MR. DYKES: The testing channel?

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. That's all I can think
7 of.

8 MR. MASTRONARDI: I guess the only comment I
9 would make is in terms of having established a minimum
10 based off of that cross-section of products. And I do
11 think Dr. Sprague may have mentioned this. I don't
12 recall. But in terms of what that does to your factors
13 by eliminating the compost filter sock from that data
14 set. But I would also at the same time say what would
15 it be had our product -- and I don't know if it would
16 have passed or failed if it were installed differently,
17 properly I should say.

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: I was only saying your product
19 because it wasn't currently something that was already
20 in the manual prior to it as far as checkdams.

21 MR. MASTRONARDI: But I guess my comment to
22 that would be, if we said that it failed based upon a
23 blowout and so the test was not completed, had it not

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 blown out, what would have been those numbers? And vice
3 versa, whether you take compost filter sock out, put
4 silt fence is, whatever you do. I think it's a broader
5 question. If we are going to speak to the manual, in
6 terms of the manual, I don't think we can separate that
7 from those questions that exist for the testing.

8 MR. DYKES: I think these should be discussed
9 at this time, absolutely. I think the committee needs
10 to decide how comfortable or what questions or comments
11 you have as related to the testing that was done
12 regarding the checkdams at this point for us to move
13 forward on the checkdam part of the manual we're talking
14 about.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: I know Joel had said he'd
16 possibly rerun any of the tests if you thought it was
17 installed wrong. So that could possibly be an option,
18 pending that we have some kind of resolution or
19 something, because I know that was said as well as far
20 as which way we were going to go.

21 MR. PARKER: It would be good if every failing
22 BMP had a chance to be redone, for the supplier to have
23 a chance to have it retested, that we initially tested

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 and failed. And the GDOT silt fence, I'd like to see it
3 installed such that the DOT agrees that it was installed
4 per plans, and then we can say we really did test the
5 GDOT check barrier. I don't know if Joel, Dr. Sprague,
6 was going to do that for no additional funds.

7 MR. MASTRONARDI: And I think to that point,
8 Reece, the question is whether or not there is agreement
9 that there were installation deficiencies. If it's
10 maintained that there weren't any, I think you're back
11 to what he did offer, and that was retest it; if the
12 results don't change, you pay. If the results do
13 change, then TRI absorbs that cost. But I think that
14 goes to the heart of does it need to be TRI's position
15 to say I'm happy with all the results. I think it's up
16 to the committee to make that determination.

17 MR. PARKER: I think, since there is some
18 controversy about the installation on some of the
19 products, that we need to be sure they were installed
20 per manufacturer's recommendation.

21 MR. BROWN: Can that check that you guys are
22 talking about, the DOTW is what I call it, can that be
23 installed properly in the slope that TRI has? Because

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 every slope or ditch line is different, and I just
3 wanted to make sure that it can be installed according
4 to DOT specs and their required slope.

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think it's reasonably
6 close to get the result. It will either pass or it will
7 fail, but I do think the wire gauges and the number of
8 wires, they do have an impact on that. I appreciate the
9 comment, Thomas, because, to Ben's suggestion as well,
10 and it came from elsewhere, ditch sections are different
11 throughout the projects. Some are swales; some are
12 flat-bottom ditches. They are not all the same, but for
13 the most part that structure deviates from what you see
14 on the highway, that ditch channel. But I think
15 accepting the nature of the testing, standardized
16 testing, I wouldn't have any objection to doing that.

17 MR. BROWN: I just believe that in that narrow
18 a ditch it's hard to put that much in it to make it
19 effective.

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: Yeah. But I think it would
21 be unfair for us if we were to say make a ditch for the
22 DOT. I'd be run out of town.

23 MR. HAMIL: I think the test should be set up

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 where our local testing people here in the state can
3 test it. Plus I think you should consider for the socks
4 a double row of them be tested also. Like you say,
5 there's so many different shapes of ditches. Plus in
6 the test I witnessed in those slide presentations,
7 looked to me like the slope was pretty steep and the
8 velocity of water coming down was great, so you're going
9 to need a whole bunch of stuff in there to slow that
10 down and drop out the sediments. So I think that we
11 ought to come up with a method of testing that can be
12 done locally in the state rather than depending on one
13 testing agency, based on the ditch they set up that
14 didn't look like a ditch that we'll see too many times.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: The ditch that's in the test is
16 just a standard one that's set up for that specific
17 ASTM, and any testing place that chooses to set that
18 method up could run that test. And originally the
19 committee, the CFS in it was higher and they looked at
20 it, and that's why they went to the .5 and the 1 after
21 talking about it, because originally the CFS in there, I
22 can't remember the original, but they were a lot more,
23 or there were more, so that you could get different

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 ideas of how they do under different flows.

3 MR. HAMIL: Was that based on drainage area of
4 a certain area and a certain rainfall or what?

5 MR. RUZOWICZ: It was the way the existing
6 ASTM already had been set up, and basically, other than
7 using a little bit smaller of a steep flow, using a clay
8 type soil was the major change that was made to it,
9 because traditionally people had been testing with sandy
10 loams, I believe. And we actually found that it is
11 possible that the setup and dry time for a clay soil
12 might have actually been a little bit cheaper than that
13 of the sandy loam soil.

14 MR. FAUCETTE: I think one of the reasons we
15 chose that and agreed to that originally is because more
16 than one place could run that test because they have the
17 setup to do that; whereas, if we created one from
18 scratch, one, I think that's a difficult proposition to
19 do, but there'd likely only be one place that could run
20 that test.

21 MR. DYKES: Knowing that following discussion
22 of this matter is having a manual on January 1, knowing
23 that any testing would have to be done between now and

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 January 1 and this committee would have to decide what
3 that performance criteria would be based on that
4 testing, that's something we need to keep in mind as a
5 committee. We've got two months, 60 days, to provide
6 some type of clarity.

7 MR. PARKER: Since you brought that up, the
8 way I see it, we have two options, maybe more than two,
9 but two options are an interim manual January 15
10 allowing us another year to do things like third-party
11 review or to do additional testing. Another option
12 would be to put out a final manual on January 15. If we
13 are going to do that, then we need to agree we're not
14 going to have third-party review, we're not going to
15 have additional testing. We need to accept what we've
16 got, the data, and move on and make adjustments as
17 needed for that final manual.

18 MR. HAMIL: I think we should grandfather in
19 the current products and then allow next year to be a
20 time for them to be tested. Between now and the
21 deadline ain't no way anybody can test anything.

22 MR. FAUCETTE: Just for clarification, Kirby,
23 are you saying the existing products that are accepted,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 include those?

3 MR. HAMIL: Those that are mentioned in the
4 manual.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: And then over the next 12
6 months allow any new products that are tested according
7 to these test methods, that pass, would then be added.

8 MR. HAMIL: Yeah.

9 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the only point I
10 would make to that is that there's never been a silt
11 fence checkdam in the manual, and part of this was to
12 see if we could get our method recognized. If there
13 were to be a grandfathering process, we'd want to be
14 part of that as well for that same period. Right now
15 we're not. Call it what you will, it's been allowed.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: It's been allowed on DOT jobs.

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right.

18 MR. HAMIL: But the DOT and the local
19 governments could refuse product or put it in. It would
20 be up to their discretion. So nothing would be -- if a
21 county or city or state didn't like a particular way,
22 they could say okay, you can't use it, our criteria says
23 you can't use that one.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the matter that is
3 before the two state departments is that the regulator
4 would rely on the manual, and short of a memorandum of
5 agreement or something that would recognize the silt
6 fence checkdam come January 1st we'd be where we've been
7 earlier in this year, that is, without the use of them.

8 MR. DYKES: So I guess my question to the
9 committee is: You've seen the tests. You've seen the
10 results. Would you feel comfortable, having seen the
11 test and the results that were done, allowing things to
12 be grandfathered in including silt fence checkdams?
13 That would be a major change. Have you seen enough as a
14 committee to make that recommendation, I guess is what
15 you need to consider.

16 MR. WATSON: When you say grandfathered in, is
17 there a time limit on it, though? Because I think that
18 gets to -- is it a one-year thing? Is it --

19 MR. HAMIL: One year, until they have a chance
20 to be able to test it, which they can't do now between
21 the December deadline.

22 MR. WATSON: I'm agreeing. The time frame now
23 is at a point that this has already been held up a year,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 and one of the original intents was to come up with a
3 way to get new products in here. And to get a hundred
4 percent concurrence in the next two months, five days,
5 is silly. If something like that gets presented into
6 the manual, this would be something that -- I actually
7 don't think it should be called an amended manual. I
8 think it should be a manual that comes out January 1st
9 of 2015. And then if we talk about this -- because once
10 you say amended, that takes a little bit of the
11 credibility, in my opinion, away; that you put out this
12 thing, and if you're going to put a grandfathered, in
13 quotes, clause, that it's pretty clear here's what is
14 the plan over the next year and here's the approach.
15 Like, if it's silt fence checkdam is going to be
16 included for the next year, we're going to test the ones
17 that failed, kind of all that language in there and make
18 it very clear this is what's being done, instead of
19 holding up the process.

20 Because there's a lot of good information
21 that's being held up because of a few comments. They
22 are good comments, but that's what a lot of this is
23 getting at. That's why we're here meeting again.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'd just like to make a
3 comment. You guys all have a packet of information, and
4 this information is what was in the 5th Edition of the
5 manual. So if we go and we look at the checkdam -- I'm
6 not against silt fence and I do think somebody will get
7 a silt fence passed one day as a checkdam, but in our
8 existing specifications there's stone checkdams, hay
9 bale checkdams, and that's it. There's not a spot for
10 silt fences. There are other kinds of silt fences out
11 there besides just your geotextile kind. So when you
12 guys make all these different comments, does that open
13 it up for more than just geotextile type silt fences? I
14 mean, how far are you guys going with the general
15 recommendation as far as the type of silt fence and all
16 that kind of stuff, if you're going to allow it, since
17 it was never in here before?

18 MR. BROWN: Also, if we keep checkdams as it
19 is in the 5th Edition, there's no filter socks.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

21 MR. BROWN: So that will eliminate filter
22 socks being used.

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: All I was saying originally is

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the stone and the hay bales or straw bales, whatever you
3 want to call it, nobody has questioned that testing.
4 Maybe you can come up with a recommendation off those
5 two so that new products that want to come forward from
6 those can continue on and we're not holding anybody up.
7 I don't know if that's a bad idea or a good idea, but
8 it's just a way that somebody can continue, if they have
9 a product that's being held up somewhere, to continue on
10 and have a process for it.

11 MR. FAUCETTE: I feel like I'm hearing maybe a
12 couple options here. One is that come January for the
13 checkdams it's basically drop checkdams and the straw
14 bale new installation are the two options, and then
15 moving forward anybody can test anything as long as it
16 passes the criteria, and then it could be added to the
17 list. That is one thing, and then the other I'm hearing
18 is that grandfather in the four items, I guess,
19 including silt fence and the sock, for 12 months, at
20 which point they can be retested over the year. And if
21 they pass, they stay; if they don't or they're not
22 tested, they come off.

23 MR. MASTRONARDI: I would just remind you that

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the factors were developed inclusive of a product we
3 could eliminate.

4 MS. JORDAN: So those might need to be
5 revisited too if we were going to retest some of these
6 materials.

7 MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't have it committed to
8 memory. I can't tell you where it fits and drops out of
9 the box, but if it alters that factor, you need to look
10 at that. And again, I think there's been plenty of
11 discussion on it. I'd be cautious about any reference
12 back to the 5th because the 5th really was just a matter
13 of velocity reduction unquantified.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: Generic. Now we have a way to
15 let new stuff in.

16 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. But, I mean, for
17 these specifically just the purpose was velocity
18 reduction, and we've actually gone to a performance
19 measure beyond that in the 6th.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think when you go back and
21 you look at the revised numbers, I'm going off memory,
22 but I think that the compost sock at the 2 CFS flow was
23 the highest one. So the old recommendation was 20

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 percent; the new recommendation was 30 percent. And at
3 the new recommendation everything had to fit in there,
4 so the rock and the straw would still fit in there at 30
5 percent control. But if you want to make it higher, the
6 only other thing is I would say definitely we would take
7 out the definition of what a blowout is, because, if we
8 are specifying a number, it doesn't matter somebody's
9 opinion as far as what a blowout is or what a blowout
10 isn't.

11 MR. DYKES: As an agency, I'd like to know
12 what the committee's comfort level is related to this.
13 What's your comfort level? Were you pleased with the
14 results? Thought we got what we wanted? That would be
15 helpful for me. Because I think moving forward we've
16 got a factor, and if the committee is okay with it,
17 that's going to affect the recommendation, and if you're
18 not happy with it, you wouldn't recommend the factor
19 without more information. So is the committee happy
20 with the testing results as presented or do you have
21 concerns that would change your recommendation here?
22 That to me is the key issue.

23 Getting back to what Marc said, we were going

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 with a velocity dissipator; now we're going to a
3 sediment efficiency. If the test gives what you needed
4 as a committee to move forward with that, I guess is
5 what I'm asking, or does it need to be retested,
6 changed, another method, whatever?

7 MS. FULLARD: Could you refresh my memory why
8 we left the silt fence out of this? Was it because it
9 didn't meet the standard, and we put the sock in?

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: That's as far as I know.
11 That's all I can remember.

12 MS. FULLARD: As a regulator, it would be very
13 difficult if we grandfather products that weren't in the
14 book to begin with. While I understand the DOT, those
15 aren't slopes and wets that are typical to a normal
16 development, and this is catering to a larger
17 development. So unless it met the testing criteria that
18 we had set originally I'm not sure I would feel
19 comfortable just opening it up to a bunch of products
20 that weren't in the original manual nor made the testing
21 criteria in the new manual. Again, I feel fairly
22 comfortable with the results that we got on the
23 checkdams.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: The number would need to be
3 revised for those recalculations that were found.

4 MS. FULLARD: Right.

5 MR. RUZOWICZ: So whatever the number you
6 specified would need to be revisited.

7 MR. FAUCETTE: The performance recommendation.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

9 MR. PARKER: So you're saying if it goes to 30
10 percent, then --

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: That was the new
12 recommendation.

13 MR. PARKER: And if we accept that
14 recommendation, then the GDOTW check falls within
15 performance standards?

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: There's still a question as to
17 whether it was installed correctly.

18 MR. PARKER: So you don't know how it performs
19 now, essentially.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think there are some numbers
21 there with it, but to say that -- I don't know.

22 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think it still comes down
23 to if there's agreement on the installation being

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 acceptable or not. If that was not, then the reality is
3 we don't know the result. The test was called on the
4 basis of a blowout while the data was continued to be
5 collected, and it still goes back to was it installed
6 properly for our detail. It could be run again and it
7 may absolutely fail, but I would like to have that
8 opportunity.

9 MR. HAMIL: Marc, I'd like to ask you a
10 question: The stone checkdams are permanent structures
11 rather than temporary, aren't they?

12 MR. MASTRONARDI: Not for the department.

13 MR. HAMIL: It takes a lot of money to remove
14 all that stone once you put them in.

15 MR. MASTRONARDI: There's that, as well as for
16 us removing the quarry stone in southwest Georgia is an
17 expensive proposition.

18 MR. HAMIL: So some stone checkdams leave in
19 permanently, wouldn't you?

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: No. Well, we could, but we
21 try to eliminate them because they create a roadside
22 hazard. They're either going to be behind a guardrail
23 or outside of a guardrail.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RICHARDSON: This says under maintenance
3 that they're supposed to be removed once final
4 stabilization has occurred.

5 MR. HAMIL: Basically the ditch test I saw,
6 that ditch needed to be paved immediately as soon as
7 possible or you're going to wash the whole ditch away.

8 MR. PARKER: Ben, how many products are we
9 talking about potentially grandfathering in? We're
10 talking about the GDOT check, and is there another one
11 that's controversial that did not make it?

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: How many different types of
13 silt fence are out there that are going to be used as a
14 W pattern, and then if there's a different kind of silt
15 fence out there, is that going to be allowed the same as
16 the other silt fences? You know what I'm saying? How
17 do you differentiate those that are out there?

18 MR. PARKER: What we're talking about
19 grandfathering in are just the products we selected to
20 use as baseline data to test, right? We are not talking
21 about grandfathering all products. I kind of agree with
22 Adena that maybe, if it was not in the Green Book to
23 begin with, so why should it be grandfathered in now,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the GDOT check? If that's the case, then there's
3 nothing else we'd be grandfathering in and we just move
4 forward. And if somebody wants to test the GDOT one,
5 and I think Dr. Sprague ought to live up to what he said
6 and do it again for GDOT, then it would be included in
7 the Green Book if they pass, just like all the other
8 products.

9 MR. RUZOWICZ: I mean, per the old manual the
10 compost filter sock was technically in there as a
11 checkdam application because it was prior to that
12 edition, so that's why that was in there.

13 MR. PARKER: And now it's in.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah, it's still in there, but
15 I want to say this: You could even say there's been
16 questions on that one as well. You could say that one's
17 got to go back and redo the test as well and we're going
18 to look at the two generic ones, the straw and the rock.
19 How many people are going to argue against straw and
20 rock? I don't know. Just a thought.

21 MR. HAMIL: In this one you got the straw and
22 the rock and the compost filter socks, in that 6th
23 Edition.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. I'm just saying there's
3 been questions as to how the compost filter sock was
4 installed and all that other kind of stuff during the
5 testing. So to more easily validate the testing and
6 show that we've done a good thing or haven't done a good
7 thing, whatever, the rock and the straw use to set those
8 standards because those are more generic BMPs that not a
9 single company really owns besides the quarry that
10 brings them out or the farmer that makes the straw bale.

11 MR. HAMIL: I think for the checkdam the
12 filter socks and the fences should be a double row. If
13 we have a double row, you get much more capability of
14 stopping rather than just a single row of each one of
15 them.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. The specification
17 hasn't changed as far as the slope and the way that
18 they're put out. Depending on the height is when -- the
19 bottom of one basically is the top of another in the
20 slope, depending how it is. So if you have a product
21 that's not as tall, you're going to have more of them.
22 If you can get a product to pass that's twice as tall,
23 you're going to need that many less. So depending on

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 how you make your product and what you can get it to do
3 during testing is going to depend on how it's installed
4 for the generic stuff, whether you have one, or whether
5 you have two, and how close they are. When we tested
6 this stuff, we tested one, just because to be fair to
7 the manufacturers.

8 MR. HAMIL: I don't understand why the hay
9 bales would pass and the silt fence with the socks
10 wouldn't pass. That seems strange to me that one would
11 pass and the other one wouldn't.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: Just in looking at it, it's not
13 that the compost didn't pass. It's not that -- they
14 specified so much removal within, or not removal,
15 velocity dissipation removal, whatever you want to call
16 it, was in control. Some of those products just didn't
17 fall within that control, and then the other one was
18 just a question as to whether it was installed correctly
19 or not. So I'm just trying to give an option.

20 MR. HAMIL: Was the silt fence installed just
21 straight across rather than W shape?

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. That was the W pattern
23 that we were looking at. There are some studies out

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 there as to different ways, why silt fences are
3 installed different ways, and there's no doubt in my
4 mind down the line somebody is going to find a way to
5 get a silt fence to pass the checkdam test. And when
6 they do, they'll have a product that, who knows,
7 somebody will want to buy. And who knows what other
8 kind of BMPs that are going to come up with checkdams.
9 For all I know, and we're talking about three things
10 right here, there could be, when we open this up, ten
11 different BMPs that do things differently that could do
12 just as well a job that we're not even thinking of right
13 now.

14 MR. BROWN: Looking back at the compost filter
15 sock, there's nothing in here as far as installation per
16 manufacturer. Also, on the detail it doesn't say
17 anything about that. I think for a checkdam standpoint,
18 as far as the way the 6th Edition is, if we add some
19 notations as far as meeting the specs for the
20 manufacturer on installation for the socks, then we
21 should leave the stone checks, the straw bales, and the
22 socks how they are, just add a notation per
23 manufacturer's recommendation. Because I know in the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 past there was a question on how all of the socks were
3 installed, if they're installed properly with this many
4 stakes or that many stakes, but each one of them is
5 going to be different. So if we put a specification in
6 here or wording in here stating that, then that
7 eliminates any questions as far as proper installation
8 for each product.

9 MR. PARKER: We talked about doing that in the
10 front of the 6th Chapter to kind of cover them all, and
11 I agree we should do that.

12 MR. BROWN: Even just to clarify it, putting a
13 note on this Figure 6-12-4, note Number 6, just like we
14 did on the previous one, just so it's said twice just
15 for clarification. Because a lot of times people only
16 look at the detail; they don't look at all the
17 literature.

18 MR. HAMIL: Well, looking at it, stone
19 checkdams, straw bales, the socks, if I'm the contractor
20 and if I'm going to have to put in stone and then have
21 to remove it, that's going to make it financially not a
22 very good choice. The straw bale checkdam, easy to put
23 in, easy to take out, that's probably going to be what

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 everybody will use.

3 MR. PARKER: Kirby, the detail we tested was a
4 beefed-up version of what we typically use in Georgia.
5 The hay bale detail is the NRCS standard, which is a
6 buried bale, so it's a lot more difficult to install
7 than the previous.

8 MR. HAMIL: And that would make it more
9 expensive too.

10 MR. PARKER: And time consuming, yeah, labor.
11 So it may not be chosen because it's so deep, so
12 rigorous now.

13 MR. HAMIL: Then the question is which one is
14 the cheapest.

15 MR. BROWN: Depends on what quarry you go to.

16 MR. HAMIL: Well, to remove the socks, you
17 don't have to bury them; you just set them on top of the
18 ground and stake them down. So that would be the
19 cheapest because they would be easy to remove.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: Does anybody have a problem
21 with using ASTM 7208 as the testing method for this
22 test?

23 MR. HAMIL: Is that the one used by TRI?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. BEHREND: There was a public comment about
3 the soil type.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: What was the comment?

5 MR. BEHREND: This is the American Excelsior
6 Company's Page 2 checkdam section.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: So it seems like they're
8 worried about loss of data that they've already done
9 because we specified a different type of soil from what
10 traditionally has been used in these types of tests,
11 from what I'm reading. So I would assume they are
12 meaning the sandy loam, which has already been done, to
13 the clay loam which the committee had gone with. The
14 other thing that deviated was the flow rates, the CFS.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: Say that again, Ben.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: I would assume that they're
17 wanting to go to the -- I don't know this. They want to
18 go back to whatever the traditional 7208 went with for
19 generic purposes so that they don't have to pay to
20 retest. The committee had decided to go with the clay
21 type soil, so that changes it so that they would have to
22 go back and retest more toward the clay soil that we
23 find in Georgia. It says, "Manufacturers would have to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 retest each product, which would drive up the cost to
3 the State of Georgia. Existing ASTM 7208 should be
4 acceptable for approval." So that goes from the clay to
5 the sandy loam. And then the worry was that if we have
6 flows that are that high all the time, are we just going
7 to blow out every single BMP.

8 MR. PARKER: So the flow rates for the
9 standard 7208 --

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: I believe they're higher.

11 MR. PARKER: We deviated from that as well.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes.

13 MR. FAUCETTE: We removed the highest value;
14 is that correct?

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't remember the numbers.
16 I know we're .5, 1, and 2, and I know there was two in
17 the other one but I can't remember the number.

18 MR. FAUCETTE: I think there was also a 3. I
19 can't say for sure. We removed that because I think --
20 I remember discussing this -- because basically nothing
21 could pass that.

22 MR. PARKER: I guess we'd still take the data
23 from a previously run 7208. The lower flow rates are

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 included in the results.

3 MR. WATSON: I know why we changed to the
4 different soil, but if somebody has a product that could
5 actually do whatever the percent reduction is, it would
6 be to their best interest to test it for them to make
7 sure that it does pass. Because even if you do apply it
8 in a clay or sandy loam, if it doesn't pass, then it
9 comes back into the inspection of it. I kind of see
10 where this point is coming from, but we do have -- we
11 got to come up with a specification, and then this would
12 go away, similar to the spacing in the slope
13 stabilization, because it wouldn't matter. Because then
14 it has to pass wherever you apply it. So if you come up
15 with the performance standard of 25, 30 percent,
16 whatever we're going to agree to -- I don't think it
17 should be 50 percent. That's a little crazy. But that
18 would take away from what type of soil was used so that
19 you could use previous, in my opinion, you could use
20 previous tests.

21 MR. FAUCETTE: Are you saying we should allow
22 all soil types and just have one performance number or
23 we should have soil types and have different performance

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 numbers for each soil type?

3 MR. WATSON: What I'm saying is, if we come up
4 with a performance standard, then if somebody has
5 existing data that was outside of the way this was
6 tested that shows it's meeting the performance standard,
7 then it probably should be accepted. However, if their
8 test that was done is in a different type of soil than
9 what's going to be seen on site, it still, it has to
10 maintain that on site, so that's going to come down to
11 the inspection.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: From what I see, different soil
13 might test with different properties and have different
14 outcomes as far as how the particles take cement in and
15 stuff like that. I think you might get different
16 outcomes from different types of soil, and I think to be
17 equal it would have to be the same type of soil for all
18 the different BMPs that were being tested.

19 MR. WATSON: If somebody is stating that
20 they've got a product that is meeting a percent
21 reduction, then if people start applying it and it's not
22 meeting it, then, one, that product is probably not
23 going to be bought because it's not being met, or it's

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 not meeting the criteria, or the commission may not
3 approve the plan because they'll say your stuff, we're
4 continually seeing that it's failing.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: I think I agree with you in
6 theory but I think it will put a lot of work on the
7 inspectors to determine if it's been tested under the
8 right soil in which we're putting it. Maybe that's a
9 question for the inspectors.

10 MR. JORDAN: I don't see a problem leaving it
11 modified as is. Anything that's tested from here
12 forward would follow the same modified test. The only
13 concern I would see is if somebody has existing data
14 that was probably generated before all this even started
15 with this committee, would they be able to use those
16 figures on sandy soil? I don't know if that exists or
17 not, if that is a concern.

18 MR. DYKES: One option to consider might be
19 in this case what was in the 5th Edition, adopting that
20 to go in the place of this, checkdams, but allowing new
21 products as of January 1 to meet a new standard. That
22 would allow you to bring new products in, checkdams that
23 could be used, but it would also allow new products

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 moving forward, you know, if you had concerns or
3 questions about the test or the 30 percent or 25 percent
4 control, whatever it is. That might be one option.

5 MR. WATSON: I'd say to do that and keep the
6 6th Edition and have filter socks in here, because
7 obviously filter socks passed the criteria that we had.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: There's controversy over
9 that.

10 MR. WATSON: Going back to the grandfather
11 clause potentially, then that is one of the things that
12 we're saying that's going to be one of those areas
13 that's going to be retested.

14 MR. PARKER: That's a way to handle that,
15 yeah.

16 MR. WATSON: It gives the filter sock a
17 one-year opportunity to prove itself either through
18 retesting or -- well, retesting, new data.

19 MR. HAMIL: On the compost sock for checkdam,
20 it says, "Compost sock size to suit conditions. See
21 approved list." I can't find an approved list, but the
22 question is what size sock was used in the test to see
23 if it would pass or fail, in the TRI test. Ben, do you

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 know?

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: The 12-inch, I believe.

4 MR. HAMIL: So if you wanted one that would
5 pass, you could use a bigger one, right?

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't know. That's going to
7 be the same question as far as, if you get a silt fence
8 that passes at this height, is it still good at a higher
9 height. And the more you think about that, the more
10 pressure it gets on it, is that going to cause it to
11 perform differently? I don't know.

12 MR. HAMIL: I'm talking about the socks.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: I know, but it would be the
14 same thing for silt fence people. Their silt fences can
15 be made higher. I mean, you've got to look at
16 everything equally. If you're going to make one vehicle
17 to go from 12 to 18 and it's okay, then it's going to be
18 the same thing for the silt fence to go from 24 to 36
19 without having to retest. And is the amount of pressure
20 that builds up on those products going to be able to
21 (Inaudible) and still do the same thing. I don't know
22 the answer to that.

23 MR. HAMIL: I don't either.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: Hence the discussion on taking
3 what's in the 5th. Every minute that goes by we're
4 closer to January 1, and at the end of the day Glen at
5 EPD is going to be asking what is the recommendation.
6 We need clarity for the industry, certainly, those
7 installing.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: So the 5th Edition says that
9 compost filter socks could be used as a hay bale
10 application.

11 MR. THOMAS: I don't remember that being in
12 there.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: It wasn't in the book but it
14 was an amendment that was added to it I don't how many
15 years afterwards. I think in 2007 or something like
16 that.

17 MR. THOMAS: I thought the original approval
18 of the filter sock was in place of hay bales or Type B
19 silt fence.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: That's right.

21 MR. THOMAS: For a sediment barrier, not
22 checkdam.

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: There is another one for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 checkdam as well.

3 MR. PARKER: We wouldn't want to carry the hay
4 bales from the 5th Edition, though, at least not the
5 detail, because it was proven not to work at all.

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

7 MS. JORDAN: What about leaving it as is with
8 the 6th Edition, retesting over the next year. For one
9 year leave it in the 6th Edition, retest over the next
10 year, the DOT silt fence and the compost filter socks,
11 if there's a question about how it was installed.
12 We can look at the envelope again, because that's where
13 a lot that's going to potentially affect it is, because
14 we're looking at all the products together (Inaudible)
15 survived. We use the performance factors for now that
16 we've got, but the following year, 2016, look at the
17 newly generated envelope and see if those factors need
18 to be changed. For now let's go ahead and accept what's
19 there. It might not be perfect but I think it's
20 important to have those performance criteria.

21 MR. WATSON: I completely concur. And if it
22 helps people to be comfortable and we're going to have
23 some sort of -- I don't know where you put it in here,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 but some, I'm calling it a grandfather clause but that's
3 probably not a right term, specifically call out these
4 two are going to be retested, you know, actually call
5 those out so that it's not, doesn't give the impression
6 that because filter sock was in this one and it's
7 approved, that it means that it's going to stay in. But
8 at least the testing that was done it did pass.

9 MR. BROWN: I agree.

10 MR. PARKER: And when we say the performance
11 standard, is that the 30 percent?

12 MS. JORDAN: For now keep what we have.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: The new recommendation is 30
14 percent. You would need to revise the recommendation
15 because the calculation was revised with the error that
16 was found. So I would say you would need to revise the
17 recommendation as far as what was originally done from
18 the control slope. At the 2 CSF flow it's got to meet
19 so much percent, whatever.

20 MR. PARKER: Are we going to keep the modified
21 ASTM or are we going to go to the nationwide? That's
22 just another thing we need to decide, maybe separately.
23 I like the idea.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: I don't see any problem leaving
3 it with the clay loam modified test method unless
4 there's a huge pool of data out there that's getting
5 thrown out because it was done on sandy soil.

6 MR. DYKES: Question regarding the issue at
7 hand, the retesting. Who is doing the retesting?

8 MS. JORDAN: Another big question. And who
9 pays for it?

10 MR. DYKES: That's a huge question. It is the
11 question. So are we telling the manufacturers or DOT in
12 this instance that they're going to do the retesting, or
13 does the committee recommend the commission does the
14 retesting, or are you saying TRI under their existing
15 contract needs to retest, per the previous contract
16 needs to retest? Those are pretty big issues at hand.
17 It's easy to say retest. It's a lot harder to have it
18 done.

19 MR. WATSON: I was under the impression that
20 TRI is retesting a couple of these that the installation
21 method was questionable. Is that not the case?

22 MR. DYKES: That's been discussed but there's
23 nothing formal.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: If I were still around I'd want
3 additional money for every test.

4 MR. PARKER: Dr. Sprague did mention -- it's
5 probably in the minutes. He made that statement last
6 meeting that he would extend that offer to people who
7 were not satisfied with the test. So it sounds like he
8 would be willing to do it.

9 MR. DYKES: But if the same results came
10 out --

11 MR. PARKER: He would expect to be paid for
12 it. That's correct. So then who would pay?

13 MR. DYKES: So there's an opportunity for
14 payment. We need to sort through that, or the committee
15 needs to make a recommendation. Certainly you're making
16 a recommendation to the commission board, but what's the
17 committee's feeling on that?

18 MR. HAMIL: It would be to their benefit
19 everything failed so the person asking for the test
20 would have to pay for it. And having experienced tests
21 before, you can make it come out sometimes any way you
22 want.

23 MR. PARKER: It's only one product we're

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 talking about, because the rolled product already
3 passed. So we couldn't make the rolled product
4 manufacturer pay for a retest.

5 MR. DYKES: So is it the committee's
6 recommendation or agreement that it was installed
7 correctly?

8 MR. PARKER: I think there's agreement it's
9 controversial.

10 MR. DYKES: That's the key to the matter here,
11 and I think we're kind of dancing around the elephant in
12 the room, to be honest.

13 MR. PARKER: Maybe TRI would agree to pay for
14 the test regardless if it passed or failed for the
15 rolled, and then for the W silt fence check, that the
16 commission would pay for a failing test.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: I would think you have to prove
18 that the compost filter sock was installed incorrectly,
19 first, per the contract. I don't know what that is but
20 I think we need to have proof.

21 MR. WATSON: So let's really dance around the
22 elephant in the room. How much does it cost to do a
23 test?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: \$2,000.

3 MR. WATSON: \$2,000, and we're talking about
4 two different tests?

5 MR. HAMIL: Question: Is it done for three
6 rainfalls? That's nine tests.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: It's done for three flows.
8 There's not a rainfall in this one. It's a flow rate of
9 .5, 1, and 2 CSF.

10 MR. HAMIL: So it's done three times.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: Each flow, yes.

12 MR. WATSON: So a test is not \$2,000; a test
13 is \$6,000. So we're talking \$12,000. That's the real
14 elephant in the room.

15 MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm not sure that's the real
16 elephant. I think the question -- and again, my role as
17 an adviser and nonvoting member is to get you thinking.
18 Brent raised the question to the group: Would you say
19 the installations were acceptable per those
20 manufacturer's installation or the guidance provided?
21 That has to be -- there has to be some conclusion on
22 that. You can agree there's controversy, but that's
23 nebulous. You're not going to get anywhere until you

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 say either yes, we support it, or no, we don't. And at
3 that point you can worry about what your next step is.

4 MS. JORDAN: Could maybe y'all refresh us, if
5 you know, what was the wording in the contract? How
6 were these things to be installed? Was it per
7 manufacturer's recommendation?

8 MR. DYKES: If it was an established practice
9 in the Green Book, it would be installed per the Green
10 Book; if not, then it would be installed per the
11 manufacturer's recommendation.

12 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think there was a matrix
13 on those that you also brought in the department.

14 MR. DYKES: Right. Exactly.

15 MR. PARKER: I suggest that we decide that the
16 GDOT check was not installed properly because the
17 manufacturer says it wasn't.

18 MR. MASTRONARDI: I wouldn't take it on my
19 word. I provided the info, plenty of video hours for
20 your enjoyment.

21 MR. PARKER: And then the rolled product, I
22 would say it was installed properly because the
23 manufacturer was there to ensure it.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: Did you say it was installed
3 properly or was installed per the manufacturer's
4 instruction? I know that might be semantic, but my
5 point would be this -- and it was brought up at the last
6 meeting, and I'm not going to belabor it. I'm going to
7 try to restrain myself. But there's a detail in the 6th
8 Edition and there's a different staking that's there.
9 That's what the picture showed me.

10 MR. PARKER: This detail is generic. These
11 details are not trying to represent the manufacturer's
12 recommendation.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: They're not, Reece, but I
14 then think the presentation we saw did show the
15 manufacturer's recommendation.

16 MR. PARKER: And they need to be documented by
17 TRI so that --

18 MR. MASTRONARDI: What I'm saying is the
19 presentation we saw in Macon showed the manufacturer's
20 recommendations with X number of stakes, and then you
21 had images of more stakes than that.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: There was nine stakes in the
23 picture.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm not going to speak to a
3 number.

4 MR. PARKER: But the color brochures, the
5 presentation in Macon of the color brochures from that
6 manufacturer, are not necessarily the manufacturer's
7 recommendations. The end-all be-all of the
8 manufacturer's recommendations is what's documented at
9 the time of the test.

10 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think that would be up to
11 someone's debate. I just would caution that you don't
12 take any of that lightly. You may well be doing this
13 with another court reporter in a different setting would
14 be my concern.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: Is there a way you can do it
16 without those two?

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: What's that?

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: Is there a way that could be
19 done without those two included so we still have a way
20 forward?

21 MS. JORDAN: So that's what I was getting at,
22 is we still have the performance criteria number to go
23 by, but again, that was derived from a whole set of

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 products, many products, that were tested. We don't
3 know if we were to retest silt fence and if we were to
4 retest the compost filter socks, would that change the
5 envelope, which therefore might change our performance
6 criteria. That's why I'm saying, if money's no object,
7 if we could retest those and see if that changes our
8 number, but in the meantime let's go ahead and use what
9 we've got.

10 MR. PARKER: I like that idea. And then the
11 next question is who is going to pay for the retesting.
12 If we say that the GDOT silt fence check was not
13 installed properly, then TRI owes us another test for
14 that, unless they want (Inaudible). That should be our
15 stance. And then for the filter sock, I feel like you
16 could pass this again -- well, it would have to be paid
17 for by the commission, to retest the filter sock. And
18 that's just to clear all the controversy about the
19 installation. I mean, in my mind that's kind of one
20 step toward third-party independent review. It's just
21 quality assurance.

22 MR. WATSON: I think I agree with you that the
23 DOT silt fence, TRI needs to prove they installed it

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 correctly. If they didn't, then they need to retest it.

3 If they did install it correctly, then now it's on DOT
4 or whoever to now pay for any additional tests.

5 MR. RUZOWICZ: I want to make you aware that
6 there is documentation saying it was installed
7 correctly; there's documentation saying that it's
8 installed incorrectly from the stuff that you guys have
9 been e-mailing. So you guys have it both ways. Just to
10 let you know you've got Joel coming back saying it was
11 installed correctly, and you have GDOT saying it's
12 installed incorrectly in the stuff that was sent to you
13 guys.

14 MR. PARKER: I think it was installed
15 incorrectly based on the fact that the wire grids were
16 not per the specifications. It wasn't tied at the top.
17 I mean, just those two alone says it's not per
18 manufacturer's recommendation. Forget the geometry.
19 The structural parts were not according to
20 specification, and that was obvious.

21 MR. DYKES: We're going to go about five more
22 minutes and we're going to take a break.

23 MR. PARKER: So talking about who's paying for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 it, if TRI won't redo it, it sounds like, only thing I
3 can come up with is out of the commission budget.

4 MR. DYKES: That's fine. Committee, make a
5 recommendation. Y'all give me your recommendation. I'm
6 ready to move on. We've discussed this to death. I
7 need your recommendation.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: You guys still want to specify
9 blowouts in the performance?

10 FROM THE FLOOR: No.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay. So blowouts are no
12 longer going to be specified. Do you want to revise the
13 performance number from the recalculated stuff that was
14 already there?

15 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay. You guys had already
17 said that 7208 was the way that you still wanted to
18 proceed. Do you still want to use clay soils or do you
19 want to use the sandy loam soil?

20 FROM THE FLOOR: Clay.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: So then the clay, so that's the
22 same. Do you want to revise it back to the traditional
23 way with all the flow rates that were there before, or

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 do you want to leave it with the .5, 1, and 2?

3 FROM THE FLOOR: .5, 1, and 2.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: So that leaves you down to what
5 is the recommendation that you want to go with. Do you
6 want to go with the new revised one from Joel at TRI or
7 do you want to look at a higher number, or how do you
8 want to do that number?

9 FROM THE FLOOR: Go with the revised number
10 for now.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: Go with the revised number. So
12 I believe that's 30 percent using the existing test that
13 we already have. Then you guys have the W pattern left
14 and the compost filter sock, and until you guys come to
15 an agreement about what's going on with that, it doesn't
16 matter what happens with those two because then new
17 people can still come in from what you guys have already
18 decided that can be done, because they can run off these
19 recommendations that you've already made within 30
20 percent. You guys just got to get the compost sock and
21 the W pattern stuff straightened out for later, but
22 anybody else that wants to come along with something
23 will have a way to get in there. I don't know how

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 you're going to do the W pattern and the compost sock,
3 but you still have a recommendation for all the other
4 stuff.

5 MR. DYKES: The question at hand is does the
6 compost filter sock stay in whatever edition we're
7 having.

8 MR. WATSON: I think it should.

9 MR. DYKES: Mr. Watson says yes.

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: I see a no.

11 MR. MORAN: If it wasn't installed properly,
12 why would it be left in?

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: So maybe the recommendation was
14 until they could go back and retest, whether they do it
15 on their own or the committee decides something
16 differently, and then they bring that data forward if
17 they were to retest just like anybody else.

18 MR. WATSON: I'm fine with that, putting in a
19 one-year period, a due date that needs to be provided.
20 I don't know who is paying for the testing. I still
21 think that's one of the big elephants in the room, you
22 know, but I think it gives a one-year option for those
23 to be included, and if they're not, then they're not.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 They're not going to be in for the 2016.

3 MR. FAUCETTE: If we're talking about product,
4 not practice, and in this case I think the manufacturer
5 would be willing to pay to be on a list. If we're
6 talking about a generic practice, that's different
7 because there's a handful, a bunch of companies that --

8 MR. WATSON: That's why I'm for leaving the
9 compost sock in.

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: As a generic recommendation
11 where anybody can go test their compost sock to come
12 into the manual.

13 MR. WATSON: I mean, we're again getting back
14 to we're trying to come up with a way for new products
15 to come in. That's a product that's been there as long
16 as I've been practicing, well, kind of early on. But
17 compost filter sock has always been there. We've just
18 now called it out with something -- you know, now it's
19 got its own call-out. It passed regardless if there's
20 debate on whether or not it was installed correctly. It
21 appears to be that it was, but I think leave it as is.
22 But I think there needs to be some, and I don't know
23 what to call it, something in the new edition coming out

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 in 2015 that qualifies some of these things that we're
3 talking about, about these two particular items are
4 going through this one-year trial period, whatever the
5 terminology is, that they're going to be somehow
6 reevaluated over the next year as to whether or not they
7 make it into the 2016 edition.

8 MS. JORDAN: I think you could even say,
9 without even reference to products, saying some
10 retesting is going to be done to revisit the performance
11 factor to make sure. I mean, you need to remember, silt
12 fence is in there to begin with, so I wouldn't even
13 mention silt fence in any kind of note.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: And when somebody does come up
15 with a way, it might be called something totally
16 separate. I don't know what kind of alterations they
17 are going to have made to it, what kind of stitching
18 patterns they're going to have, but it could be called
19 something totally different from a silt fence checkdam.
20 There's a lot of opportunity.

21 MR. DYKES: To come to a conclusion maybe
22 before lunch, if you're in favor of leaving the generic
23 compost filter sock in the new edition of the manual,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 raise your hands in the meeting room. Those in
3 opposition? Anybody abstain? Okay. The committee's
4 recommendation is that it stays in. On the Georgia DOT
5 W installation, it's not called for in the manual. It
6 doesn't reference it in the manual. Anybody willing to
7 say they would like to add that to the manual? Does
8 anybody agree it needs to be rested? Raise your hand.
9 Thank you. Is there any other discussion on checkdams?
10 Seeing none --

11 MR. FAUCETTE: Just so I'm clear, on the
12 product, it does need to be retested, or there's a year
13 that it needs to be retested?

14 MR. DYKES: The generic compost filter sock
15 has been left in.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: That's generic. So then the
17 individual products would have to go back and be
18 retested just like everybody else.

19 MR. DYKES: It is now 12:18. We'll reconvene
20 at 1:00 p.m.

21 (Lunch Recess)

22 (Adena Fullard was not present after the lunch
23 recess.)

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: We are going to call the meeting
3 back to order and continue with Chapter 6, comments and
4 discussion. We are looking at major revisions of
5 Chapter 6. We finished up checkdams before the break.
6 Item 5 is the channel stabilization section of Chapter
7 6. That starts on Page 137.

8 MR. FAUCETTE: I think just a clarification.
9 I don't know if it was said or not, but just to be
10 clear, I know at the beginning of the chapter there's
11 verbiage or going to be verbiage "per manufacturer's
12 recommendations." It needs to be probably at the
13 beginning of the checkdam section too.

14 MR. DYKES: Yeah. We'll take care of that.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: Okay. I wasn't sure if that
16 was said.

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm sorry. I thought of
18 something at lunch. I think the committee's
19 recommendation was to have the fabric checkdam, silt
20 fence checkdam retested. I just wanted to know what
21 would, quote, be passing, if we keep in mind that it was
22 used as part of the methods that were going to generate
23 the data set to create the P Factor. Is it a matter of

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 simply pass/fail with regards to a blowout? Or are you
3 going to hold it to a P Factor that it was not part of
4 generating the average for?

5 MS. JORDAN: My intent was on the retest to
6 revisit the P Factor.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: It wasn't a P Factor for this
8 test. It was whether they specified a blowout or a
9 nonblowout, and then within so much of control. So
10 every single test that's run is compared to its control,
11 so that if you have a person that is doing this test in
12 another laboratory, it's compared to their control
13 that's set up the same way, so hopefully it takes out
14 that variability that might be there. So it's within
15 percent of so much of control at the 2 CFS flow.
16 Originally we had looked at the .5, the 1, and the 2.
17 The .5 weren't taken into consideration because they
18 looked at the 2. But originally it was thought we might
19 have some smaller BMPs that would only pass the lower
20 flows that could be used in lower flows. After going
21 back and looking at it, the check, the rock and straw
22 bales both passed the 2 CFS flows, so they said if they
23 could do that, basically everything should be able to do

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that. In looking at that, it's possible that you might
3 not even have to test for the .5 or the 1 if you're not
4 truly using that; you're only looking at the 2. But it
5 was within so much of control. The original
6 recommendation was 20 percent, I believe, and the new
7 recommendation is within 30 percent of control. Then
8 they said they didn't want to use blowouts, so it would
9 just be within 30 percent of the control.

10 MR. MASTRONARDI: Okay. That's what the
11 testing would be.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: I mean, from what I have in my
13 notes they wanted to use the recommendation, and as far
14 as I know that was 30 percent. Blowout would not be a
15 specification.

16 MR. MASTRONARDI: Okay. Fair enough.

17 MR. DYKES: Channel stabilization, Item 5,
18 Chapter 6, Page 137. Questions or comments regarding
19 channel stabilization. I think there was some
20 performance criteria considered here. Ben, you want to
21 expand on that?

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay. Basically the manual is
23 the same as it was before as far as categories with the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 feet per second that was there. What they did is they
3 added, so that you could have a shear stress, they added
4 a note in there that shear stress equipment was okay.
5 It's also noted that people can be more stringent than
6 what is already in the manual. The test that they went
7 with was 6460 and the existing ASTM for channel
8 stabilization, which I believe DOT has some studies from
9 Georgia Tech which more greatly breaks it down even
10 further but still falls into these same generic
11 specifications that we have.

12 When you look at that ASTM 6460, it gives you
13 the equivalency per second and shear stress right next
14 to one another on the front cover, so you are able to
15 see that. So whether the DOT is specifying shear stress
16 or an engineer wants to use feet per second, the front
17 of that test should be able to give you the information
18 that you need so that the DOT and the existing manual
19 will be able to work together and allow new products
20 into the manual while running the test for 6460. But
21 other than the specifications that are here, it's the
22 exact same zero to five, five to ten, and then ten
23 above. So if you look at the stuff that I handed out

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 earlier with the existing specifications, you'll be able
3 to see how the channel stabilization was drawn up.

4 MR. DYKES: I don't think we've had any
5 comments to this point on this BMP.

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Nobody has made any comments as
7 far as the channel stabilization section as far as 6460.
8 Before it broke it down into riprap, vegetative, and
9 concrete lining, and in those it gave the velocity for
10 them. So riprap was five to ten, vegetative was --

11 MR. MASTRONARDI: We had it in the old manual
12 as well as the new. When read literally, I don't know
13 if we really mean this where we say, "Unusually large or
14 attractive trees shall be preserved." Should that be a
15 should?

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah. Where is it at?

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: Under the planning criteria.
18 I don't know if anybody ever got in trouble for it, but
19 it does have a mandatory condition there.

20 MR. DYKES: Any other comments on channel
21 stabilization?

22 MR. BROWN: I think if that one line item is
23 removed, we wouldn't have any problems with it.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: I would say change shall to
3 should.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: That was in the existing thing,
5 so it just got transferred from the other one the same
6 as what it was before. So change that shall to should.

7 MR. DYKES: Any other changes? Hearing none,
8 channel stabilization is approved with one change: shall
9 to should. Item 6, sediment barriers, adding a
10 performance criteria and a sensitive and nonsensitive
11 designation. Sd1 is in your manual on Page 189, Chapter
12 6. Open for discussion.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: Could we go over the
14 concerns that have been raised to date regarding this?

15 MR. DYKES: Absolutely. Concerns regarding
16 how the P Factor was selected, the testing method to get
17 to that; why S and NS were designated at the different
18 breaking points in the data. The use of Bentonite and
19 the test method itself, 11340, has been part of the
20 discussion to this point.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: As far as categorization of
22 BMPs, before there was a practice for A, B, and C. Are
23 we fine with having different groups as far as two

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 different standards for a sensitive and a nonsensitive?

3 MR. PARKER: Yes.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: So that still somewhat follows
5 having a different category for A, B, C. So regardless
6 of what the test is, whatever the outcome is, you guys
7 are saying there needs to be a different category for
8 sensitive and nonsensitive. That wouldn't change the
9 overall abbreviation of what we have here.

10 MR. DYKES: Let's talk about the test method,
11 11340. A lot of information was presented at the last
12 meeting on October 9. Discussion on the issues as
13 presented, or new issues.

14 MR. HAMIL: I think the test is much too
15 complicated. I think we should do away with the P
16 Factor and just have percent retained. I think all the
17 products that are currently being used, the socks and
18 silt fence, would be grandfathered in. The test now
19 runs nine tests on each product, three for each
20 rainfall. I think we should eliminate it down to one
21 rainfall, and that would mean only three tests would
22 have to be run and that the test then would cost
23 considerably less, and the tests could be set up where a

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 local testing company could do it. And I think we set
3 up the slope, the rainfall, pick one of the rainfalls,
4 and the length of the test slope, et cetera, should be
5 set where it could be easily set up by a local tester
6 here in Georgia. And if we grandfathered the ones in,
7 if a local government or the State decides they don't
8 like one of the products, that's their prerogative, plus
9 the design engineer should be able to set it up if he
10 wants a particular product.

11 MR. DYKES: So in that instance, Mr. Hamil,
12 let me be sure I understand. So you're saying every
13 product that's on the DOT qualified products list would
14 automatically be put on the approved list.

15 MR. HAMIL: Yes, including the socks and the
16 silt fence. The TRI test, with the amount of mistakes
17 they made, I think we need a test system where people
18 here in Georgia could run it also at their own
19 qualifying testing.

20 MR. DYKES: So you're recommending a new test
21 also, test method?

22 MR. HAMIL: Well, I'm recommending only one
23 rainfall and to set up a certain slope, amount of water,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 well, the rainfall would set the amount of water, but
3 the length of the slope and et cetera. Because right
4 now it costs several hundred thousand dollars to set up
5 a test site, best I could learn.

6 MR. DYKES: Other discussion?

7 MR. FAUCETTE: I have a question or
8 clarification on what Kirby's recommending. As far as
9 grandfathering in, is that for a specified amount of
10 time?

11 MR. HAMIL: Well, four or five years, and then
12 the advisory committee could extend it or whatever, and
13 that we have all next year to come up with that test.

14 MR. DYKES: Comments?

15 MR. FAUCETTE: I do have a little bit of
16 concern creating a test method from scratch. I think it
17 would be a lot for either this committee or another
18 committee to take on to create something from scratch
19 and then have an organization that is unknown at this
20 point to be able to build it and run it all within that
21 time frame. I think it's a lot of work. It's quite
22 expensive, and then I think there would also be the
23 question that would have to be asked is it acceptable

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that the State would require testing at only one
3 laboratory. The current one can be done by multiple
4 laboratories.

5 MR. MORAN: A lot of the other states or some
6 of the states around Georgia, like Florida, they use a
7 test method -- I've got the actual test from the
8 different states here. They use ASTM 5141. That's
9 Virginia, Florida. It's somewhat of a performance
10 test, if you will, and it's been done by the State of
11 Virginia. And it came out, gosh, 20 years ago, what's
12 called VTM 51 and 52. So if you want to do business, if
13 you will, in the state of Virginia, you have to have
14 your product NTPEP tested. I'm talking about silt fence
15 now. We have to do the same thing in the state of
16 Georgia. We have to send it out. It's NTPEP tested.
17 Georgia tests it again, and then it's either approved or
18 disapproved and we start all over again. We have a flow
19 rate and a filtrate efficiency on this other test
20 method, and it can be done by a lot of labs, and it's
21 ASTM approved, 5141.

22 My only heartburn, being a geotextile
23 manufacturer, silt fence manufacturer for the last 20

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 some years, everything we ever do is ASTM. It's not
3 something else that's not been approved by ASTM. If
4 this 11340 is an ASTM test or modified test, I can see
5 it. I think you do have to have a performance test
6 method or standard of some sort. And the states, 5141,
7 set it up themselves, at 80 percent filter efficiency
8 how many gallons per minute, so forth, or you can do 75,
9 whatever it is you want to do, depends upon your state.

10 The test, TRI can do it, and I'm sure there
11 are other people that can do it. I don't have any
12 heartburn about the State of Georgia being able to do it
13 if they want to set it up and do it. It's fine to use
14 another testing lab. You have labs all over the country
15 who do testing. To me that's the, I won't say the
16 easiest, but it's a performance test that can be
17 replicated over and over again. This test, it was a
18 good idea in my mind, but it was different. That's all
19 I can say. And it's very expensive. I mean, you're
20 talking \$6500 a test or something like that I heard.
21 This test you can do once every three years. It's a lot
22 less expensive. Might give you the same end result.

23 MR. HAMIL: That sounds much better.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think the group had
3 originally talked about that, but I don't know that all
4 the BMPs can be run through that one test. So I don't
5 think that you could have a roll of carpet or a straw
6 bale put through the 5141 test the same as you could a
7 geotextile fabric. I think that's what I remember from
8 the original meetings. But as far as I know, you'd have
9 one test over here for silt fence and you'd have a
10 different test over here for all the rest. I think the
11 group originally was trying to find one test in which
12 everyone was going the exact same way. That's when it
13 had come down to a couple different ASTMs or test
14 methods that the group had talked about.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: I do remember, Bob, and I know
16 you weren't there in the previous committee, but we did
17 look really closely at that method and discussed it.
18 Aside from some of the issues that Ben brought up, the
19 group also wanted something more large scale as well,
20 not bench scale in nature. They thought it would better
21 replicate closer to real-world conditions but still
22 having some sort of standardization. And then also the
23 sediment concentrations I think they use in that test

111

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 are extremely low. I think they're 2- to 3,000
3 milligrams per liter of sediment, which is not anything
4 you'd ever see on a construction site. On construction
5 sites we often see 50- to 100,000 milligrams per liter,
6 which is something more like what we'd see in the test
7 that we did run, 11340. So those are some of the
8 discussions we had, and one of the reasons we didn't
9 choose it to begin with. We did talk about it as a
10 potential option earlier.

11 I think probably a little bit of clarification
12 may help the group too. We've been referring to the
13 test as ASTM Work Item 11340. In reality we did modify
14 it, and the way that we modified it is actually ASTM D
15 6459, the exact same test we're using for the erosion
16 control products, and we're using the C Factors for
17 those. And there seems to be pretty broad agreement,
18 not only within the committee but also from other
19 organizations, to use that test for erosion control
20 materials and to use that C Factor. And I think that
21 was part of the discussion in the previous TAC Committee
22 of those modifications, to mirror that and to use that.
23 I don't know if that helps with some of the previous

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 discussion.

3 MR. DYKES: So I guess one point of
4 discussion is does the committee feel one test -- are
5 you heading in the direction you want one test for all
6 products to be tested, or is the committee willing to
7 vary the test based on the type of product that's
8 presented?

9 MS. JORDAN: I would say one test, because
10 what if some very innovative new product comes out that
11 maybe doesn't fit into our silt fence test or doesn't
12 fit this or here exactly? If we have one for
13 everything, we can compare across the board.

14 MR. PARKER: I agree.

15 MR. MORAN: 11340, is that a test you'd have
16 to do once every three years? Is that the idea?

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. The idea was that you'd
18 run it once. Once every three years you'd send a letter
19 saying that your product hasn't changed. If you weren't
20 able to give us a certified letter saying that your
21 product had not changed, then you would have to go back
22 and redo the test because you changed a property within
23 your product that originally had passed. That was the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 thought behind it, not to make you go back and retest
3 every three years. It was one time. Then you submit a
4 letter every three years, notarized or however, saying
5 that your product has not changed or undergone any kind
6 of -- you know, basically isn't a different product from
7 what you originally tested. That was the original talk,
8 not that you have to retest it every three years.

9 MR. MORAN: (Inaudible)

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. NTPEP, they don't set
11 standards. They just pick tests to run, and then from
12 there it's up to whoever to set the standard however the
13 state wants to set the standard.

14 MR. HAMIL: Some companies have three and four
15 products, and that's \$16-, \$18-, \$20,000 for testing,
16 and that's way too much. Why do we need three different
17 rainfalls to be checked on?

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: To be what?

19 MR. HAMIL: Three different rainfalls to check
20 it.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: It just follows the 6459, which
22 was already an ASTM.

23 MR. DYKES: That's news to me. I thought we

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 were using the test method, and now we're saying we're
3 using ASTM 6459.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm not saying we're using it.

5 MR. DYKES: You might need to clarify that for
6 me because I'm totally confused. I've been told test
7 method --

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: 11340 originally I believe had
9 an 8-to-1 slope. It was modified through the group to
10 use a 3-to-1 slope, to also use a clay soil. It closely
11 follows the ASTM 6459 which does the 2-, to 4-, to
12 6-inch rains for slope stabilization products. But now,
13 instead of putting a matting and blanket or
14 hydraulically applied product down, it allows you to put
15 a sediment barrier at the bottom.

16 MR. DYKES: Why are we at the third committee
17 meeting and this has just come up? I don't understand
18 that.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: It has been mentioned before
20 that it closely follows it.

21 MR. DYKES: It either is or it isn't.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: It isn't an ASTM, but it
23 closely follows.

115

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: And that's what we're going to
3 proceed with, it's not an ASTM. That's my
4 understanding. Does anybody disagree with the fact that
5 11340 is not an ASTM?

6 MR. FAUCETTE: I would clarify. 11340 is not
7 an ASTM but the modifications we made are what ASTM 6459
8 is now. Does that make sense?

9 MR. DYKES: No, it doesn't make any sense,
10 because either it is or it isn't. It's either yes or no
11 I think is the answer. Is 11340 an ASTM, yes or no?

12 MR. HAMIL: Well, the ASTM Bob mentioned
13 that's used by Florida and some other states, does it
14 give worse results than this one that cost \$6500 a test?

15 MR. DYKES: This is the first I've heard of
16 the one Bob mentioned. I don't know anything about it.
17 It might be a very good test. I don't know. I'm just
18 trying to get clarity on 11340. It's a test method, to
19 my understanding.

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Right.

21 MR. DYKES: It's not an established ASTM. I
22 just want to deal with the facts. It may model
23 something, and that's great, but it either is or isn't

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 an ASTM.

3 MR. FAUCETTE: But just to be clear, we are
4 not following 11340 as it's written, either.

5 MR. DYKES: Right. We put clay soil and we
6 changed the slope. I get that. But because we modified
7 it didn't make it an ASTM either.

8 MR. FAUCETTE: No.

9 MR. DYKES: I just want to be clear. I don't
10 want anybody on the committee to think we're doing an
11 ASTM if we're not. If we are, then we want to make that
12 clear also. So let's talk about 11340. We saw a video
13 at the last meeting. You've had a stack of videos to
14 look at. What's the committee's feeling on 11340?

15 MR. HAMIL: Too complicated.

16 MR. DYKES: Mr. Hamil says too complicated.

17 MS. JORDAN: I don't have a problem with it as
18 a test. The previous TAC obviously put a lot of work
19 into it, and I don't have any reason to second-guess
20 what they did.

21 MR. BROWN: Any test method that's agreed upon
22 I think there's going to be questions either way.
23 Whether we use the 11340 or we use an ASTM, we're going

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 to have the same questions. I agree with Betty Jean
3 that using 11340 is the best way to go.

4 MR. HAMIL: I think that all the products that
5 are currently being used should be grandfathered in for
6 four or five years to keep them from having to spend all
7 this money being tested when the products are being used
8 all over the United States, and here in Georgia we've
9 been using silt fence for 50 or more years. And why do
10 we need to test them again just to verify they already
11 work? And the socks are the same way.

12 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think my take-away from
13 Macon was the performance of the testing was the
14 question. The consistency and so forth, I think we all
15 heard those points made. What that does to the
16 conversation about 11340 being a good test, I think we
17 have to separate those two questions and answer that.

18 Again, this was provided while we were at
19 lunch and it makes the point, again, that some products
20 that were used had Bentonite applied and others did not.
21 I think that issue is not going to go away. If we are
22 silent on that, I don't think it goes away. I think
23 those concerns are going to be there. The question is

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 whether or not, to me personally, I suppose, again, it's
3 not whether or not TRI is comfortable with the results
4 that were obtained; it's that the TAC is, that in your
5 mind you can square those issues to say, "I would be
6 willing to defend that. I'm comfortable with everything
7 it indicates."

8 MR. PARKER: We should take one at a time.

9 MR. DYKES: Test method 11340, if you are in
10 favor of 11340 as a committee member, raise your hand.

11 MR. PARKER: The Georgia version of it.

12 MR. DYKES: The Georgia version with the clay
13 and the slope, yes. Those opposed? Okay. Thank you.
14 All right. Let's talk about the methods, the testing
15 method or the results that came from that.

16 MR. MASTRONARDI: The execution.

17 MR. DYKES: The execution of that, discussion
18 on that matter.

19 MR. HAMIL: Well, from looking at the slides
20 and presentations and all from the last meeting, I don't
21 think it's acceptable at all.

22 MR. FAUCETTE: Do you think all of it or some
23 of it?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: I think if we proceed on and
3 approve it, we're going to be in real trouble.

4 MR. DYKES: Other comments? Let me rephrase
5 it another way: Was the P Factor affected by the test
6 method, the issue that some of you have presented? Did
7 the Bentonite affect the test results, the P Factor? I
8 think that's a point of discussion, because the P Factor
9 is the deciding point, whether you have an S or NS.

10 MR. HAMIL: I think the doctors from Auburn
11 indicated that.

12 MS. JORDAN: The test method allows for the
13 Bentonite, so I don't see why there's a problem using
14 it.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: The whole thing what we were
16 doing was to set benchmark standards. There's been a
17 lot of talk about the Bentonite causing different
18 outcomes. It allowed for it but it looks like a lot of
19 people don't like it. There is a lot of them that were
20 already run without using Bentonite. We're looking at
21 just setting up a benchmark standard, so can we look at
22 those ones that had no Bentonite in them just to set a
23 minimum number and have a benchmark number so we can

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 allow people who are new to come into the manual, a
3 process to come in? And at the same time keep the
4 traditional A, B, and C for a while until everybody has
5 had a fair chance to do whatever. I don't know. I'm
6 just thinking out loud. I don't know if that's the
7 right thing or not.

8 MR. WATSON: My one comment is that the way
9 that was phrased it allows the general public to pick
10 and choose between the parts of the test method, what
11 they like and do not like. And I believe if Bentonite
12 was used, it should have been used on all products.
13 Part of it comes down to, if it was used, it should have
14 been used on all products; and if it was not used on all
15 products, then we're comparing apples and oranges to
16 come up with this number for the P Factor. But I don't
17 think we can throw out one side or the other because a
18 group of people say they don't like Bentonite. I think
19 it would have to be, something would have to address the
20 fact that the different tests are not comparable amongst
21 one another because they were set up differently.

22 MS. JORDAN: I have a question about the use
23 of Bentonite in the test that somebody can clarify for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 me. It's allowed in the testing procedure, and seems
3 like, if I remember correctly, it was only installed in
4 a particular test run if it was needed. Like if it
5 started getting seepage under or around, then they'd
6 stop the test, put the Bentonite on, and then resume the
7 test. So maybe in some runs it wasn't an issue so they
8 didn't have to put the Bentonite. I don't think it was
9 the testing lab saying okay, we're going to put
10 Bentonite on this test but not on this one. I mean,
11 there was a reason for them to put it on some tests and
12 not others.

13 MR. PARKER: I read somewhere Dr. Sprague said
14 that it may have been that the test bed moisture content
15 was higher in the later tests and that's why it was
16 required more often in the later tests, that they
17 decided to start using it at that point, the Bentonite.
18 I'm not sure if it was installed prior to the test run
19 or during the test run.

20 MR. WATSON: I'd have to defer to some of the
21 folks who have done a lot more tests in this. Did the
22 use or lack of use of Bentonite affect the P results? I
23 don't know that from my experience. I'm not saying one

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 way or the other, so I'd have to defer to other folks.

3 I think that would be -- somebody asked that earlier, I
4 think Brent. And if it did affect it, or if it has the
5 opportunity to affect it, then I think it needs to be
6 reevaluated.

7 MS. JORDAN: We had a couple graphs from last
8 time, and I thought I had it with me but I'm not putting
9 my hands on it. Joel presented it to us. He had
10 everything, and then he had another one where he took
11 out the results where the Bentonite was used. I'm going
12 off of memory and I could be wrong here, but it seems
13 like they were substantially the same, the separate
14 results. Does that ring a bell with anybody?

15 MR. DYKES: I think that was provided in the
16 written comments that Joel provided back from the first
17 meeting.

18 MR. FAUCETTE: I'm trying to go by memory
19 here, too, so if anybody -- oh, you have it?

20 MS. JORDAN: I do have it.

21 MR. FAUCETTE: There was a product that used
22 it for a run or two runs but not for another, and the
23 data was substantially the same. Does anybody remember

123

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that?

3 MR. DYKES: Other comments from the result of
4 the test?

5 MR. HAMIL: I've got a question. Why do you
6 need to test for three rainfalls when, if you test it
7 for one rainfall, you cut your cost by two-thirds?

8 MR. FAUCETTE: I don't think it's the multiple
9 rainfalls that contribute to the additional cost in the
10 test. It's the replicates, the three replicates that we
11 use, so each replicate costs, and Joel would probably be
12 better to answer this, but roughly \$2,000 per replicate,
13 and each one of those replicates gets to 2, 4, 6. So if
14 you ran it at 2 all the time or 4 the whole time or 6
15 the whole time, I think the price is going to be the
16 same, the way I understand it.

17 MR. HAMIL: Doesn't sound right to me.

18 MR. FAUCETTE: I think all you're doing is
19 introducing more water in the replicate.

20 MR. HAMIL: You'd have to run it nine times
21 for each product; where if you only had one rainfall,
22 you'd only have to run it three times, the way I figure
23 it.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: Brent, you asked if there
3 were any other comments. The only thing I would say is
4 that Bentonite wasn't the only concern that was raised.

5 MR. HAMIL: The next question is the products
6 that are currently approved, would they be grandfathered
7 in for how long?

8 MR. DYKES: I think that's up for discussion.

9 MR. FAUCETTE: Do you have a recommendation?

10 MR. HAMIL: Five years.

11 MR. FAUCETTE: I'm opposed to five years. It
12 seems like a lengthy time. What are you basing five
13 years on?

14 MR. HAMIL: Well, the \$19,000 is one of them,
15 and the products that are being used we've been using
16 them for a considerable time. They're used in other
17 states. I've been out to construction projects and
18 looked at projects that have both of them on there after
19 a big rainfall, and all the products seem satisfactory
20 to me.

21 MR. WATSON: I think five years is too long.
22 I'd go with the three years because that's when the
23 letter needs to come and reevaluate it with the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 commission. I think five years is a little long.

3 MR. MASTRONARDI: So is that to say the test
4 method is a good method and the execution is acceptable?

5 MR. HAMIL: Not by me.

6 MR. PARKER: I think we've all agreed that the
7 test method is acceptable, so now we're trying to decide
8 whether the testing that was done for us was done
9 properly per the test method.

10 MS. JORDAN: That in turn determines where
11 we're drawing the line, so to speak, between what's
12 acceptable for sensitive and nonsensitive applications.

13 MR. DYKES: So let's call the question. If
14 you think the test methods produced by 11340 are
15 acceptable as presented, as a committee member, raise
16 your right hand. If you think they're not acceptable.
17 Okay. So do you think the P Factor for sensitive, which
18 is .03, is acceptable? It's up for discussion.

19 MR. HAMIL: I think we should eliminate the P
20 Factor and just have the percent of silt retained.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: Based off this test?

22 MR. HAMIL: I don't like this test, but y'all
23 have already agreed on the test, so then yes. Percent

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 silt retained, everybody understands that. To
3 understand the P Factor you got to go back and look at
4 all the equations and all the variables that they
5 selected numbers for to come up and figure out what it
6 means, which it took me a long time to do.

7 MR. WATSON: I'll be honest, I'm fine with
8 either way; there just needs to be a method, I mean,
9 there needs to be some sort of standard. The P Factor
10 is directly related to the sediment retained, so it
11 doesn't really matter.

12 MR. HAMIL: Why not choose then silt retained
13 which everybody can understand immediately?

14 MR. WATSON: I mean, the flip side of it is
15 I'm an engineer, I understand the P Factor just as well,
16 right? So, I mean, it just kind of depends. They are
17 both directly related, so I'm either one.

18 MR. FAUCETTE: I could go with either one as
19 well, because honestly they are the same thing,
20 honestly.

21 MS. JORDAN: The P is directly out of the
22 equation.

23 MR. FAUCETTE: The one thing with the P Factor

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 is that it can be inserted into the equation, and we
3 have already agreed here that the C Factor is okay to
4 put into that equation. Are we going to say that the P
5 Factor is not? That's open for discussion.

6 MR. WATSON: What you'd have to do is, if you
7 go percent retained, then you calculate the P Factor and
8 you have to go back to the equation. It's the same
9 thing. We're arguing how to represent it versus what
10 the actual value is.

11 MR. FAUCETTE: Right.

12 MR. HAMIL: Yes, but the percent silt retained
13 is an actual number from the test. P Factor is
14 something that's put into an equation that has variables
15 in it.

16 MR. WATSON: Like I say, I am comfortable with
17 either way.

18 MS. JORDAN: Really the question comes down
19 to, I think, where do we want to draw our boxes on the
20 chart. That's the question.

21 MR. WATSON: There was one suggestion at one
22 point to take the highest value so that, at least within
23 these products, they would be, they would all get into

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the system, and then there would be, down the road when
3 more testing -- I'm not saying who is paying for it.
4 Just down the road as more tests came in, that that
5 would be added and the number would be revised. I can
6 easily see the debate where people say that the .03 and
7 the .045 are somewhat arbitrary, so I'd also be fine
8 with going with a max P value on the two different types
9 to come up with that, with the understanding, because
10 it's going to happen as years go on and more data comes
11 in, that those numbers will be revised.

12 I would actually add one thing to that. I'd
13 probably add maybe a standard deviation. I'd put some
14 sort of statistic to that number, as opposed to saying
15 it's right about there. We talked about this again in
16 the last committee meeting, to take the data, come up
17 with some sort of either standard deviation from the --
18 I think we actually talked about a standard deviation
19 from the mean at one point, but it would be on the high
20 end and it would accept all the products that were
21 tested, but it would also be able to back up what that
22 number is as opposed to drawing boxes.

23 MR. FAUCETTE: I do remember that discussion.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Just so I'm clear what you're saying, you're saying
3 instead of having two levels, are you saying have one
4 where all the current products that were tested would
5 fit in, with the idea that down the road this committee
6 or another committee would explore as more data comes
7 in?

8 MS. JORDAN: If we do that, we are essentially
9 throwing out sensitive right now. We're just saying
10 everything passes.

11 MR. WATSON: I don't know what the right
12 answer is. My gut says that there should be a sensitive
13 and nonsensitive, and there's so many different ways of
14 arguing. I think as long as we can back -- I think
15 there should be two numbers. I'll answer it that way.
16 I think there should be a sensitive and nonsensitive.
17 I'm not in favor of the .03 and .045 as eyeball numbers.
18 I think there should be some statistic to come up with
19 what those numbers are. I'm probably more in favor of
20 doing a standard deviation based on the number of points
21 that there are. That would be my recommendation. And I
22 think, when I've done the math, I think actually all the
23 products then become, they would fall within the two

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 sensitive and nonsensitive ranges.

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: Are you going to incorporate
4 straw bales this time? Last time the only thing that
5 didn't fit in that range was straw bales.

6 MS. JORDAN: You're saying it didn't fit in
7 based on the standard deviation?

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: It didn't meet the minimum
9 number of --

10 MR. WATSON: Yeah, I think I'd still exclude
11 straw bales, in my opinion.

12 MS. JORDAN: Really what we'd be doing is
13 everything that was tested minus the straw bales would
14 be designated acceptable for sensitive or nonsensitive
15 applications. We'd still have two numbers. Any future
16 products that were tested possibly would only be
17 approved for the nonsensitive areas but not the
18 sensitive.

19 MR. WATSON: Potentially, yes.

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Or neither?

21 MS. JORDAN: Or neither. If we did that,
22 right now we would have nothing approved for
23 nonsensitive only. Everything would be nonsensitive and

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 sensitive. If we were to do that, is there any desire
3 to revisit the way any of the testing was done? We
4 don't have issues on this like we did with the
5 checkdams. Bentonite was really the main issue on the
6 installation.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: There were some other issues
8 brought up with wind. There was another issue brought
9 up with water going through a silt fence.

10 MR. BEHREND: There was a question about
11 installation as well.

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: Installation of which BMP?

13 MR. BEHREND: The sock.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: The compost sock?

15 MR. BEHREND: Too many stakes.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: Too many stakes? It had them
17 every two feet? Is that what happened?

18 MR. BEHREND: I forgot the details but there
19 was a question about installation of the socks as a
20 sediment barrier.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: What does DOT specs say for
22 compost socks as far as sediment barriers? Does it say
23 stakes every two feet?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: Actually we do have it every
3 two feet, like Guerry said earlier, Type B silt fence.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay. I knew there was
5 something. Your book is very thick and a lot of pages.

6 MR. DYKES: So P Factor numbers, what is the
7 committee's recommendation? We have .03 for sensitive
8 and .045 for nonsensitive currently that's proposed. We
9 have a comment from Mr. Hamil that said we should
10 grandfather all products in for some period of time.
11 And then for new products wanting to get in, they would
12 have to meet a P Factor of some value. So which one do
13 you want to take first?

14 MR. BROWN: I think, like Betty Jean said,
15 every product that was tested, go ahead and approve;
16 then in the three-year time period, in that third year
17 they can verify that it does meet one of the
18 nonsensitive or sensitive numbers, because by that time
19 that number is probably going to change. That gives
20 them three years to meet that requirement.

21 MS. JORDAN: In other words, do a statistical
22 analysis now to get those numbers. New products that
23 are brought online in the next three years would be

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 added to that. At the end of the three-year period do
3 another statistic evaluation. It may be that some
4 products actually that are on here now may get kicked
5 out if the deviation was shrinking.

6 MR. WATSON: I think that statistics need to
7 be used to come up with the numbers.

8 MR. MASTRONARDI: Let me just speak to what
9 Betty Jean described. I don't think in the previous
10 iteration of this committee we talked about having to
11 perpetually upgrade those numbers, did we?

12 MR. FAUCETTE: Not that I remember.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't think that was the
14 intent. So I just would share that.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think what she was meaning is
16 that -- like you have a typical Type A, B, and C. Take
17 those, whether C goes to sensitive and A and B go to
18 nonsensitive, put them on a list, and after three years
19 they would have to say whether or not they met whatever
20 number --

21 MR. BROWN: Which category.

22 MR. MASTRONARDI: This is a little facetious
23 but at some point you put a piece of 3/4-inch plywood

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 out there, right? And then the only thing that passes
3 is equivalent barrier. I don't think we mean that.

4 MS. JORDAN: No, I'm proposing this as a way
5 to keep the test, use data we already have, not try to
6 go to the expense of retesting a bunch of different
7 stuff, still allow other products an opportunity to be
8 brought in. We can be very diligent about the way new
9 products are tested, and then you look at the whole set
10 of data at the end of a three-year period. And I say
11 that just because products are having to submit a letter
12 anyway, so this seems like a reasonable time frame to go
13 back and do the calculations again. That's pretty
14 objective, I think.

15 MR. DYKES: So I hear two things. One is all
16 products that were tested will be accepted. And then I
17 hear all products in the DOT qualified products list
18 would be put into a category. Which of the two are we
19 talking about? Because I've heard both. I think
20 Mr. Hamil's recommendation was all products currently on
21 the QPL list DOT list.

22 MR. HAMIL: No. All products currently being
23 used by entities in the state of Georgia.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: That's a much broader list than
3 the DOT. Now we have three. I don't know what that
4 list is, but it's much broader than the DOT. And you
5 have the DOT's qualified products list, and then you
6 have what was tested, which is in the presentation that
7 you have before you, and there's people in all
8 categories.

9 MR. WATSON: We may be saying very, very
10 similar things, and I think, if you go back to
11 statistically come up with the P Factor, those products
12 that passed that, those are in. Those are the ones that
13 we're saying to include. I mean, I guess some of those
14 products are on the DOT list, so they would be included,
15 right? How many were not tested on the DOT list?

16 MR. HAMIL: One.

17 MR. WATSON: Just one.

18 MR. HAMIL: One that I know of. Yours has
19 been tested and failed, hasn't it?

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Not necessarily.

21 MR. WATSON: I would say the ones who've come
22 up with the new P Factors through a statistical
23 evaluation.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: Natural Growth Industries'
3 products hasn't done the test but they sent in a list of
4 four things that they had to meet and be qualified, and
5 that was accepted.

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Natural Growth is following the
7 alternative BMP guidance document.

8 MR. HAMIL: So it was submitted in 2010 or
9 '11, I don't remember exactly which one, before the 2012
10 deadline.

11 MR. FAUCETTE: So you're recommending anything
12 that has gone through the alternative BMP process should
13 be included?

14 MR. HAMIL: Right.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: Whether it's been tested or
16 not?

17 MR. DYKES: I don't know that we could put our
18 hands around that list. Marc, do you think so?

19 MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't think you can cover
20 it.

21 MR. DYKES: That's very broad.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: It is very broad.

23 MR. HAMIL: It was approved.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: On a per-plan-by-per-plan basis,
3 Mr. Hamil, so it had to be submitted every time a plan
4 was submitted. That's certainly up for committee
5 consideration. I just want you to know I don't know of
6 any entity that has that list or could compile that
7 list.

8 MR. HAMIL: When you specify what you have to
9 do to get it approved and then you do it --

10 MR. DYKES: But that's approved by the plan
11 reviewer, not by the commission or DOT or EPD.

12 MR. HAMIL: It was approved by the commission.

13 MR. DYKES: No, it was not approved by the
14 commission. It was approved by plan reviewers on a
15 case-by-base basis. So we don't have a list of that.

16 MR. HAMIL: Well, the products are almost
17 identical, so what's the difference?

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: When you got different
19 products, you got different things that make them up.
20 There could be some different concerns in compost socks
21 such as fecal coliform, all kinds of stuff that come up
22 as far as stuff like that. So every product is
23 different regardless of whether you have a silt fence

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 and it's woven different or you have different compost
3 in it or you have different kind of recycled carpet,
4 different kinds of Styrofoam. I don't know all the
5 different stuff that could come up.

6 MR. HAMIL: Well, if all the designers and
7 engineers on the plans, all they got to do is list the
8 name of the product and it's approved, what difference
9 does it make?

10 MR. DYKES: They have to submit documentation
11 outside of the plan too, for it to be approved, not just
12 list it.

13 MR. HAMIL: Well, they submitted that to y'all
14 and y'all approved it.

15 MR. DYKES: We can't approve it. It's on a
16 plan-by-plan basis.

17 MR. HAMIL: In the e-mail you said all we had
18 to do is --

19 MR. DYKES: I think the communication was it
20 has the elements of the four requirements but it's on a
21 per-plan-by-per-plan basis. We don't have the authority
22 to do that. So we got three lists. We've got all
23 possible alternatives. We've got what DOT recognizes,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the qualified products list. We have what was tested
3 through TRI as part of the testing contract. That's the
4 world of possibilities. And there's people that may be
5 on all the lists or some lists.

6 MR. HAMIL: Filtrexx got their test run free.

7 MR. DYKES: Yes, sir.

8 MR. FAUCETTE: So did everything on the QPL.

9 MR. DYKES: Those that were selected randomly
10 were tested.

11 FROM THE FLOOR: Let's vote. Then you at
12 least know who's on what side.

13 MS. JORDAN: One thing I'd like to point out
14 is when the 6th Edition came out, the intention, as I
15 understand it, is there was going to be an approved
16 product list to take the place of the qualified products
17 list. Therefore I think we should go forward with an
18 approved product list and our approved product list
19 should include everything that was tested. And from
20 here on out new things have to be tested and measured
21 against these, and that's how they would come on the
22 approved products list.

23 MR. DYKES: Okay. So let's put that to a

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 vote.

3 MR. HAMIL: Further discussion.

4 MR. DYKES: Yes, sir.

5 MR. HAMIL: My product is going to have to pay
6 \$16,000 to have the test run, and the competition got it
7 free.

8 MR. DYKES: I think that's up for discussion,
9 yes, sir.

10 MR. RUZOWICZ: Maybe we could just say we use
11 those numbers to set benchmark standards. Everybody on
12 that list has to go back and retest. That would be a
13 hundred percent fair then. We use those numbers to set
14 benchmark standards, and everybody else has got to go
15 back and do it, and meanwhile we'll use the transition
16 period and continue on with what -- I don't even know.

17 MR. FAUCETTE: So that data is the property of
18 the commission. It's only to be used for establishing
19 the benchmark, not to decide what's on a list or not on
20 a list. So basically nothing is on the list and
21 everything will have to be tested again per the
22 manufacturer's dime to get on that list moving forward.

23 MR. HAMIL: Marc, does DOT still run the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tests?

3 MR. MASTRONARDI: We can't do these tests.

4 MR. HAMIL: I'm talking about your old test.

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: No. Ultimately what will
6 happen is we will not be in the business of recruiting
7 new BMPs. These will be the state standards. If we
8 find we have something equal to or more stringent than
9 we have, we have a design for, we probably would
10 approach the commission to get it included.

11 MR. HAMIL: (Inaudible) in the State of
12 Georgia to run y'all's test?

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: They have to be a nationally
14 certified lab if they're going to run something for us,
15 but we don't contract any of those tests.

16 MR. HAMIL: But if a product asks an approved
17 testing company to run y'all's, would that be approved?

18 MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't know that I can
19 answer that. I think there's more to that than just can
20 another lab do our tests. I think what this does, what
21 we've all known it will do, is this will basically put
22 the decision making to these parameters, and that will
23 populate approved products, not the DOT's process.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: It takes away the people who
3 are coming with a test from UGA, a test from Wisconsin,
4 and they all got different parameters saying their test
5 is the best. Takes that decision making out of it.
6 Nothing for or against. I don't even know if they have
7 testing facilities that do this stuff but I'm just
8 saying in general.

9 MR. DYKES: Okay. So let's consider the
10 matters at hand. First, considering the products that
11 were tested through TRI and the contract with the
12 commission, those products that were tested will be on
13 an approved test, or whatever you want to call it, and
14 those results will be used to set a P standard moving
15 forward. All those in favor of that raise your right
16 hand.

17 MR. WATSON: Wait. That's meaning they are
18 automatically on regardless of whether or not they
19 compare with the benchmark; right?

20 MR. DYKES: I thought that's what I heard,
21 that those that had been tested automatically move
22 forward and are considered sensitive and nonsensitive.
23 That's what I heard. That may not be the issue you want

143

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 to consider.

3 MR. WATSON: I would maybe want to ask the
4 question on the .03 and .045 first.

5 MR. DYKES: I heard discussion that you wanted
6 to have a statistical standard deviation created.

7 MR. WATSON: Correct. Instead of using the
8 .03 and the .045, I don't know if we've agreed upon
9 changing it from a .03 and a .045 to some statistical
10 number.

11 MR. DYKES: Let's go to that first then.

12 MR. WATSON: That would be me, because we're
13 still -- maybe I'm the only one who's for doing this
14 statistical number.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: I would support that.

16 MR. WATSON: That's important, because if
17 you're going down the line, then you can say, okay,
18 these are what the numbers are and then you can start
19 talking about the products that came up with that
20 benchmark.

21 MR. BEHREND: Could you say a little bit more
22 about what the statistical number might look like,
23 without us having to do math? .045 minus .015?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. WATSON: No. It would be -- I mean, you
3 wouldn't want a plus or minus. You're just going to go
4 to the plus side, and I'm guessing it would be a
5 standard deviation to maybe the mean. I don't know if
6 that's -- I would think it should be something like a
7 standard deviation. With the number of data points that
8 we have, it's small enough that a standard deviation is
9 probably the best way to have, you know, what is that
10 upper limit. As opposed to taking one test and saying
11 that that is the upper limit, I think a standard
12 deviation is more statistically defensible to say you're
13 looking at all of the products that were tested, and I
14 think it's pretty close to accepting, when we did it
15 before, it's pretty close to accepting all of the
16 products.

17 MR. BEHREND: I just wanted to make sure we
18 understood what we were talking about.

19 MR. WATSON: I don't know what the number is,
20 though.

21 MR. FAUCETTE: You wouldn't know until after
22 you did that statistical analysis.

23 MR. WATSON: Right.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: So when you run that analysis,
3 you would then incorporate straw bales as well.

4 MR. WATSON: I said no, I do not agree with
5 incorporating straw bales.

6 MR. DYKES: All those committee members in
7 favor of running a statistical analysis to determine
8 what the sensitive or nonsensitive number should be
9 raise your right hand.

10 MR. PARKER: I still have a question. Sorry.
11 Do you intend to have this a moving target so that, as
12 more test results come in, the mean would move and then
13 therefore the threshold would move.

14 MR. WATSON: That's a different question.
15 That's like how are these things going to -- and that
16 kind of gets to what Marc is talking about, this rolling
17 thing. I don't even want to mention that because I
18 think that's a separate issue. I think to come up for
19 this edition with these numbers with the tests that we
20 have would be the data that we have. At what interval
21 are these, all the performance standards going to be
22 reevaluated? I don't know.

23 MR. PARKER: That has no relevance

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 (Inaudible).

3 MR. WATSON: Yeah.

4 MR. DYKES: All right. I'll ask the question
5 again: All those committee members in favor of taking
6 the results at hand, doing the standard deviation to the
7 mean to determine a sensitive P Factor and a
8 nonsensitive P Factor, raise your right hand. All those
9 in opposition? Okay. Thank you. All right. That
10 passes.

11 Now, not knowing what those numbers are
12 because the standard deviation hasn't been completed at
13 this time, what do we do with the products that have
14 been tested? Do we wait until we get that number to
15 determine what category they fall into, or do we make a
16 decision you make a recommendation today about all
17 products in general that were tested?

18 MS. JORDAN: I would be willing to wait,
19 assuming we still have time to make a decision on that
20 particular item before January 1st.

21 MR. DYKES: Okay. Other recommendations?

22 MR. MORAN: The problem with the 10 or 12
23 products, if you took it off the DOT QPL list right

147

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 here, there's 54 SKUs, whatever you want to call them,
3 on this list. So you took, I assume, 10 or 12, whatever
4 the number, I can't recall right now, so you're going to
5 shut out X number of folks here that are already on the
6 DOT list. Are you going to grandfather them in too and
7 assume that they are at .045 or whatever for the get-go
8 to start out, or are you just going to leave them off
9 and make them catch up, so to speak?

10 MR. DYKES: I think that's a good question,
11 Bob. I think that goes back to what Mr. Hamil said.

12 MR. WATSON: Yeah. Coming from a large
13 family, I always like to try to be in the middle part.
14 Ideally I think I'd only want to use the data, the
15 products that were tested, but that's going to cause
16 controversy, but I think that every product ultimately
17 needs to have a standard that compares to what is in the
18 book. So if all the other products, the 43 other
19 products or whatever that were not tested, then that
20 could be that three-year clause, that within that three
21 years they have to be tested so as to whether or not
22 they can be put onto the list. They would be
23 grandfathered in for a three-year period until they can

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 get a test done.

3 MR. BROWN: That's kind of what I said
4 earlier. I said all the DOT products and the approved
5 products done through the testing should be used for
6 that three-year period, and then during that three-year
7 period, the ones that did not get tested, that they do
8 have to be tested in that period of time. And that
9 doesn't eliminate anyone for three years.

10 MR. DYKES: So would you distinguish between
11 sensitive and nonsensitive for those that haven't been
12 tested?

13 MS. JORDAN: That goes back to the question of
14 at the end of the three years we could recalculate our
15 statistics and determine if that standard deviation has
16 changed, and we might want to reset the P FactorMR.

17 RUZOWICZ: I'm just thinking out loud, but if I were a
18 manufacturer, something like that, I'd go test something
19 that I would know would lower it so you could play with
20 the numbers. So you need to decide, if you're going to
21 do that, how would you want it to fall before that,
22 because otherwise I'm going to go test the product that
23 is --

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: Let's throw that out.

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm not trying to be mean.

4 MS. JORDON: No. That's a good point.

5 MR. FAUCETTE: That's a good point.

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think it may bear

7 repeating that in the past, though it's

8 counterintuitive, the flow rate of conventional Type C

9 silt fence is greater, so there's less risk of failure

10 for the whole sediment load behind the fence to reach

11 that resource. So absent some way to determine what

12 that risk is across the broad spectrum of products,

13 you're possibly putting yourselves at some risk to say

14 you know how that's going to behave today, and we don't.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: We could look at it both ways,

16 you know, with impaired streams and all that kind of

17 stuff, as far as having to meet different net-flow

18 metrics put in the units and stuff like that. The

19 arguments on that go both ways as far as the regulation

20 side of it.

21 MR. MASTRONARDI: It does, but at the end the

22 EPD is going to look at ultimately did you have it

23 installed and maintained properly. And if it's on the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 list and you've done those things, designed, installed,
3 and maintained, then that's your BMP defense, and there
4 could still be that impact to the resource.

5 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. It leaves it open to
6 choice for the designer to choose, okay, this one's got
7 this flow rate, maybe that's sensitive, this one's got
8 this flow rate, it's sensitive, I'm the designer, I'm
9 picking which one I want to use for my project as far as
10 what I need to meet for my flow-through rate, my
11 net-flow metrics (Inaudible) unit, any of that kind of
12 stuff depending on the project and the layout of the
13 design.

14 MR. MASTRONARDI: I just wanted to give that
15 historical perspective so we don't lose sight of what
16 sensitive and nonsensitive is about.

17 MR. BEHREND: Along those lines, are there
18 factors beyond the P Factor that you would wish to
19 consider when looking at sensitive and nonsensitive?
20 One idea raised earlier was the durability of the
21 products.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: In the last round of meetings
23 they had briefly talked about that, and one of the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 things that they had come up with was that the product
3 had to maintain at least 80 percent of the height. It
4 could either be maintained back to it or it would need
5 to be replaced. So that was one of the things that was
6 put into the manual as far as -- because Adena was
7 always, "How am I going to inspect this? How am I going
8 to --", you know. And they came up with 80 percent of
9 the original height that it had to maintain, be
10 maintained.

11 MR. DYKES: So what's the committee's wishes
12 on grandfathering in the DOT qualified products list,
13 bring them in in whole as sensitive and nonsensitive
14 based on some categorization, or are you bringing them
15 in all as nonsensitive and require them to test to
16 become in the sensitive category based on the new P
17 Factor?

18 MS. JORDAN: I'm not comfortable with taking
19 the whole list that hasn't been tested and saying it's
20 adequate for sensitive or nonsensitive application.

21 MR. BROWN: I think what Brent was saying was
22 go ahead and approve all of them as nonsensitive areas,
23 and the ones that haven't been tested, when they are

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tested, then they can convert them to the sensitive
3 areas.

4 MR. DYKES: All those in favor of
5 grandfathering in the DOT QPL list all as nonsensitive
6 raise your right hand. Those in opposition? Okay. It
7 passes. So we've set a new P number based on standard
8 deviation to the mean. We've decided what to do with
9 the DOT QPL list. Those that have been tested based on
10 the new standard deviation for the P Factor would be in
11 the sensitive or nonsensitive category.

12 MR. FAUCETTE: Could you say that again?

13 MR. DYKES: The new P Factor will be created
14 based on the standard deviation to the mean for
15 sensitive and nonsensitive. If a product has already
16 been tested through the testing, then they'll be put
17 into sensitive and nonsensitive category based on that
18 standard deviation to the mean. All DOT QPL silt fence
19 products will be grandfathered in as nonsensitive.

20 MS. JORDAN: But they have a requirement to be
21 tested.

22 MR. DYKES: Moving forward, right, in three
23 years, that's correct. In three years they need to be

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tested to stay on the list.

3 MR. MASTRONARDI: Let me ask a question: If
4 that rolls out January 1st, then the only products that
5 are recognized for sensitive are the ones that fall out
6 as sensitive from the exercise of creating a standard
7 deviation?

8 MR. DYKES: As agreed to to this point, yes.

9 MR. MASTRONARDI: So of those 50-odd people on
10 that list, there's winners, there's more losers, and
11 there's also -- you know, the argument that I would make
12 if I were a vendor or a manufacturer is you have a Type
13 C today, you have a Type A today, you historically
14 looked at them that way. What you're talking about is
15 how does it do in this large-scale test. But you're
16 saying I don't even want to consider it. I don't know.
17 As a whole it's coming across as that's irrelevant, it's
18 all nonsensitive.

19 MS. JORDAN: For now until we have testing.

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: But remember, for now is 65
21 days. So for somebody who has plans in development that
22 have to be done in advance for it to be bid on, my today
23 really is just about today. So we have to really

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 understand what our contracting industry is going to go
3 to come January. I just think that's a huge -- I think
4 if you heard, you thought you heard outcry previously,
5 my hunch there will be greater outcry, because that's a
6 very small -- how many silt fence products are in the
7 nonsensitive right now?

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: I tend to agree with Marc on
9 this one. There's a lot of plans already drawn up. I
10 know you've already got the Type A, B, and C, but it
11 almost seems kind of like, if there's already
12 traditional Type C, we're already looking at that data
13 as a sensitive area, so you guys have talked about a
14 three-year period. For the sake of all these plans that
15 are already drawn up and already being used, that
16 existing Type C could still be used in a sensitive
17 application. If there's somebody that wants to come
18 along new in order to make it into that sensitive
19 application, however you guys come up with the standard
20 deviation number, that's what they got to meet if
21 they're not already on that QPL or something. That's
22 their in. But due to the fact that we got millions of
23 dollars worth of plans and all different kinds of stuff

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 already drawn up six, eight, ten months in advance, I
3 don't even know how far in advance, the likelihood of
4 getting all those changed between today and the end of
5 the year probably isn't very great.

6 MS. JORDAN: But is that necessary? Those
7 were already approved under --

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: They may not have necessarily
9 been approved. They could be in the works, they could
10 be drawn up, they could be in the planning stage to have
11 somebody go back and turn around and redraw every single
12 one of those plans that might have already been done.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: I can tell you the date.
14 Sixteen weeks out from when we have a letting, a set of
15 plans is complete. So that's four months. The NOI
16 doesn't go in until roughly 30 to 45 days after that
17 letting. So when January 1st rolls around, the new
18 standard is going to be the benchmark by which the EPD
19 reviews those plans. Those plans are at that point 20
20 weeks old and they won't reflect this change.

21 MR. HARRIS: Do we have time to go through 50
22 manufacturers by January to come up with a list of
23 nonsensitive and sensitive? I mean, this is one of the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tight spots you get in when you revise a manual for an
3 entire state. It stinks, but you got to start
4 somewhere.

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: You do, and we're probably
6 the biggest player in the sandbox. We have more miles
7 going out than anybody else.

8 MR. HARRIS: But is there a way to accomplish
9 that? That's my question. I agree with what you're
10 saying, but is that an attainable goal?

11 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right now it would be Type C
12 silt fence.

13 MS. JORDAN: Is there a way to do some kind of
14 letter of intent saying we're already planning on doing
15 this under the existing --

16 MR. MASTRONARDI: No. As much as the EPD and
17 the DOT have disagreements, we don't want
18 back-of-the-napkin-type scenarios, because there's a
19 whole other balance to that regulated community.

20 MR. HARRIS: Could you say that for one year
21 Type C could meet the sensitive areas? Pull Type C into
22 sensitive area silt fence, allow a year to take a larger
23 data set, and next calendar year you better be ready

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 with tests.

3 MR. BROWN: Even at that there's a lot of DOT
4 projects that were designed ten years ago that are still
5 in the works and they're changing every day due to
6 easements and acquisitions of land and everything else.
7 So either way it changes it's going to be an ongoing
8 process with any project. So if we give that year for
9 Type C approval, then that gives it a full year but it
10 still doesn't cover everything, either way you look at
11 it.

12 MR. HARRIS: I don't think we will cover
13 everything. You have to have a reasonable time period
14 where we can say look, you had plenty of time, versus
15 two months.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: Two months is not enough time.

17 MR. HARRIS: We have to have a defensible
18 position where, okay, you had a year and two months or
19 you had a year.

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. And I agree.
21 Eventually the period plays out and it is whatever it
22 is, but I think we just have to be really conscious of
23 that, whatever you decide as a group.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. BROWN: Marc, would you be in agreement
3 upon either a year or a three-year period, like if we've
4 done the others on a three-year basis, just to have that
5 longevity for all of the projects that are ongoing?

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: Sure. I mean, obviously the
7 longer the better as long as it maintains credibility.
8 I think a three-year period, that would be very fair.

9 MR. DYKES: All right. All those in favor of
10 grandfathering in existing Type C as found on the DOT
11 QPL list as sensitive for three years raise your right
12 hand. Those in opposition? Okay. Three years it is.
13 Other discussion on silt fence?

14 MR. HAMIL: I got a question. Natural Growth
15 Industries put on more socks in Georgia than any other
16 company. They've put them down in Alabama. They've
17 currently shipped from other erosion control companies
18 to several other states in the southeast. Okay. Y'all
19 said if they had their product put on the plans, that
20 that's approved. But how long does that last? Three
21 years or zero years?

22 MR. DYKES: For that set of plans, the life of
23 that set of plans. However, just as decided by the TAC

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 now, there'll be a P Factor number set based on the
3 standard deviation for sensitive and nonsensitive, and
4 Natural Growth or any other vendor will know the number
5 they're shooting for.

6 MR. HAMIL: But if it's put on the plans,
7 y'all said it was approved.

8 MR. DYKES: For that set of plans.

9 MR. HAMIL: What about a set of plans two and
10 a half years from now?

11 MR. DYKES: Unless that company goes through
12 the testing to get a P Factor number chosen, they'll
13 always be an alternative and apply on each set of plans.

14 MR. HAMIL: So as long as they get their
15 product listed on the plans, up to that three years
16 they'd be approved?

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. They would continuously
18 have to do the alternative BMP process if they choose
19 not to go through whatever process that is set forth for
20 new products to come into the manual. And the
21 alternative BMP process is written into the NPDES BMPs
22 to get into the manual -- not into the manual but onto
23 sites.

160

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: You're saying two and a half years
3 from now, if they're listed on the plans, they're not --

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: No. What they're saying is
5 that the traditional Type C can be used as sensitive
6 applications for the next three years. Meanwhile people
7 will be doing testing.

8 MR. HAMIL: For Natural Growth?

9 MR. DYKES: No. For anything on the DOT list
10 now.

11 MR. HAMIL: For Natural Growth, if it's listed
12 on the plans two and a half years from now, it will be
13 okay.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: No, no.

15 MR. HAMIL: So in effect y'all are putting him
16 out of business.

17 MR. DYKES: No. He has to go get tested like
18 any other vendor.

19 MR. HAMIL: Yeah, but the competition gets
20 tested free.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: Everybody that got testing
22 through here has to go back and retest. That makes it a
23 hundred percent fair.

161

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. HAMIL: For everybody else.

3 MS. JORDAN: I think that was just a matter of
4 bad timing in how that all played out. The other filter
5 socks that was already an approved product that was in
6 the 5th Edition, it was selected because it was in the
7 5th Edition. And unfortunately -- this is the way I
8 understand it. The grant came through to do all this
9 testing, and the compost filter socks that you're
10 talking about, they had not been approved in any way. I
11 guess previously the board didn't approve it for
12 whatever criteria they used. Now the point is to have
13 an objective means by which a new product can come into
14 the Green Book, and the process unfortunately sounds
15 like the process with the Natural Growth, it didn't even
16 attempt to try to go through that process until all of
17 this work was begun, and so everything was sort of put
18 in a state of hold. So nothing could come into the
19 Green Book during all that process. It was just a
20 matter of timing, when things happened. So now Natural
21 Growth or any other product can go through the testing
22 procedure. MR. HAMIL: So Natural Growth is a
23 victim of circumstances.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: In effect, yes, unfortunately.

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: Has Natural Growth gone back
4 and redone their composting testing by any chance?

5 MR. HAMIL: You talking about --

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Just in general.

7 MR. HAMIL: No. They still got that one good
8 test, the one in California.

9 MR. FAUCETTE: I think it should be clarified
10 too that basically everything that was tested is
11 probably Natural Growth's competition, not just a single
12 company.

13 MR. DYKES: Just so that I'm clear on the
14 committee's recommendation, all DOT QPL silt fence
15 products will be listed as nonsensitive and Type C will
16 be sensitive for three years. Are we saying all
17 products have to be tested by the vendor in that
18 three-year period, all products?

19 MS. JORDAN: Yes, to be fair.

20 MR. DYKES: I think that's going back to what
21 Mr. Hamil was bringing up.

22 MR. HAMIL: Next question. Who is going to do
23 the testing?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: All that's specified right now
3 is it's done by a third party.

4 MS. JORDAN: Any lab that's set up to do these
5 tests.

6 MR. HAMIL: Y'all have paid TRI to set up the
7 testing facilities. They are the only ones that can
8 compete.

9 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. That was another reason
10 why the committee had gone more closely to 6459 is
11 there's other people that have those slopes already set
12 up that could possibly run this test as well without
13 additional cost.

14 MR. HAMIL: Where are they?

15 MR. FAUCETTE: Texas A&M University can do
16 this test, San Diego State University can do the test, a
17 private lab in Wisconsin can do this test.

18 MR. HAMIL: Is it the same test that TRI is
19 running, the same slopes and everything?

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Yes. I think University of
21 Central Florida can do this test.

22 MR. HAMIL: Will they charge \$6500 a test too?

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't know, but if I were

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 getting something tested, I would shop around.

3 MR. DYKES: So all committee members in favor
4 of during the three-year period or by the three-year
5 period, all vendors having to do their own test,
6 irregardless of prior testing paid for through the
7 grant, irregardless of whether you're sensitive or
8 nonsensitive, raise your right hand.

9 MS. JORDAN: I don't know if I'm ready to vote
10 on that yet.

11 MR. DYKES: All right.

12 MR. FAUCETTE: I want to be clear. I think I
13 know, but what you're saying is we're going to do some
14 statistical analysis on the P Factor which could change
15 how some of these items that were tested fit into this
16 category and all future testing. So the items that were
17 tested will fit into one of those two categories more
18 than likely, and then anything that's a Type C on the
19 DOT QPL is automatically approved for the sensitive for
20 three years, and if it's Type A or B it will
21 be nonsensitive for three years.

22 MR. DYKES: Correct. And now we're saying by
23 the end of that three-year period, in order to remain on

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the list, the question is should all vendors go to the
3 expense of paying for their own test to produce whatever
4 their P Factor for their product.

5 MR. MORAN: Two of your best silt fence
6 results are not filaments, if you look at the results.

7 MR. DYKES: Can you expand on that, Bob, what
8 you mean by that?

9 MR. MORAN: I'm just saying your test results,
10 your two best fences that came up on your P Factor were
11 not a filament silt, were not sensitive, I'm sorry, Type
12 C.

13 MS. JORDAN: If we were to require everything
14 get retested, even everything that's already contributed
15 to more data, that should eliminate any concerns about
16 Bentonite and whatever else too.

17 MR. FAUCETTE: Is three years too much time or
18 is that the right amount of time?

19 MR. BROWN: Three years gives the companies
20 enough time to budget for the testing.

21 MR. HARRIS: They've got to retest once they
22 test the first time anyway?

23 MS. JORDAN: It's just a certification letter

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 every three years.

3 MR. HARRIS: Would that not suffice?

4 MR. FAUCETTE: Bob, you seem uneasy. Are you
5 making a recommendation based on --

6 MR. MORAN: You're going to base your standard
7 deviation on a fence that is not going to be allowed for
8 sensitive areas.

9 MR. WATSON: What we were saying is that those
10 that have been tested can fall into the two categories,
11 and then those that were not tested but are on the DOT
12 list, that's where the Type C would go to sensitive and
13 the non-Type C would go to nonsensitive.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: So if you're a Type B and you
15 can go get tested tomorrow and you happen to fall in
16 whatever the categorization is that guys set for
17 sensitive, then you can be on the sensitive side sooner
18 than three years, possibly.

19 MR. DYKES: Ready to vote? More discussion?

20 MS. JORDAN: I'm a little hesitant to require
21 people that have already had their test done to test
22 again.

23 MR. HARRIS: Me too. I'm fine with everything

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 except for that. I'm fine with everything else.

3 MR. WATSON: So the 11 or 12 that were done,
4 you don't think they should have to be retested, but the
5 40 remaining number should be tested.

6 MS. JORDAN: There's a bit of unfairness, I
7 think, either way we go. On the one hand it seems
8 unfair to make these vendors go through the expense of
9 getting something tested that's already been tested and
10 and we say we're comfortable with the results. But on
11 the other hand, I see the argument too that there are
12 products that were selected for testing and they've got
13 to go spend the money now, and they say, "They didn't
14 have to spend money. Why do I have to spend money?"

15 MR. WATSON: The whole goal is to have these
16 products meet the performance criteria, and some of them
17 don't have the numerics to back up the performance
18 criteria. There's not going to be one way that makes
19 everybody happy.

20 MR. DYKES: Let's vote.

21 MR. MORAN: Make you happy.

22 MR. DYKES: Not going to make me happy.

23 Welcome to public policy. All those in favor of

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 requiring all silt fence products or Sd1 products to be
3 tested within a three-year period to remain on the
4 sensitive or nonsensitive list based on the new P Factor
5 raise your right hand. Those in opposition? Okay. All
6 will be retested within the three years, or tested.

7 MS. JORDAN: Now, we just voted on the Type C
8 silt fence. That was not all products, right?

9 MR. DYKES: All sediment barriers, A, B, and
10 C, currently, sensitive and nonsensitive. Any other
11 comments on silt fence or sediment barriers or other
12 products considered sediment barriers?

13 (No response)

14 MR. DYKES: Let's take a ten-minute break and
15 come back at 3:00.

16 (Recess)

17 MR. DYKES: We'll reconvene. We're going to
18 continue moving through the list. The next major
19 revision was related to inlet sediment traps, and that's
20 on Page 199 in Chapter 6. There was some performance
21 criteria added in. Ben, you want to talk a little bit
22 about that?

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: The performance criteria for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 inlet sediment traps was ASTM 7351. Basically it was
3 modified to run both paved and unpaved applications per
4 that sediment trap. In talking about this using this
5 existing ASTM, they felt basically with how it mixed the
6 sediment up into a water concentrate basically and put
7 it down into a pipe made it more of an application as
8 far as an inlet trap would be put in in the field, the
9 idea of having both a paved and nonpaved application for
10 those two different applications. The numbers were
11 determined off the BMPs that we had tested allowing for
12 both high flow and high retention and also giving the
13 designer the option to allow a different kind of inlet
14 protection if they needed due to some kind of threat of
15 loss of life or something like that, almost the same
16 basically kind of what it reads in the NPDES negative
17 effects. I forget exactly how it says it.

18 "In areas where BMPs are being used on paved
19 surfaces or safety is a concern, the potential negative
20 effects of ponding should be taken into account. In
21 such cases a high flow BMP is preferred."

22 MR. DYKES: Questions or comments or proposed
23 changes for inlet sediment traps?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. PARKER: Any public comments on that?

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: There was just a paper put here
4 by Hanes Geo. I haven't had time to read through the
5 whole thing. I don't know if there's something in there
6 as far as inlets is concerned. As far as inlets from
7 the existing comments that we had prior to today, there
8 are some generic comments as far as the RUSLE equation
9 as far as just performance standards in general. There
10 are people that feel we should go back to the existing
11 edition of the manual, which would put it back to the
12 way the inlet sediment trap was, so Pages 6-199 to
13 6-208, inlet sediment traps, should be deleted and
14 replaced with Pages 6-139 to 6-144, inlet sediment trap
15 attached from the 5th Edition. So all those comments to
16 go back traditional to the 5th Edition, and that's
17 pretty much with all the BMPs that we've talked about
18 today as far as some recommendations for the manual.

19 MS. JORDAN: Leave it as is.

20 MR. DYKES: Any proposed changes? Seeing
21 none, approved as presented. The next one is revised
22 retrofit adding a silt control gate.

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically what this does is it

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 takes what the DOT is already using with the silt gate
3 and lets it be used for any purpose, not just
4 infrastructure use only, but it could be used on a
5 common development or a stand-alone application. So
6 before the silt gate was only being used in
7 infrastructure practices; now it would be allowed for
8 common development and stand-alone. It's there for an
9 option for all the permittees.

10 MR. DYKES: Have we had any comments on it to
11 this point?

12 MR. RUZOWICZ: We haven't received any
13 comments on it.

14 MR. DYKES: That's on Page 182, Chapter 6.
15 Any comments? Seeing none, it's agreed to as presented.
16 Turning to the back of the page, a list of changes in
17 the 6 Edition. The following BMPs have been added: A
18 section on flocculants and coagulants, which is on Page
19 109.

20 MR. DYKES: Basically what this does is it
21 goes back to the polyacrylamide where polyacrylamide can
22 be used as both a flocculant and coagulant or a
23 tackifier binder depending on its application.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Basically we don't want somebody with a flocc block
3 trying to tack down straw with a flocc block on the
4 middle of their slope. That's not the right
5 application. So that's one of the things that brought
6 into question do we need to split it up, and that's
7 where the discussion came that polyacrylamide could be
8 both a tackifier binder and a flocculant and coagulant,
9 so we would have two different categories so that people
10 looked at it correctly.

11 MR. DYKES: No comments to date, I don't
12 think. Any proposed changes? Seeing none, agreed to.
13 Surface skimmers, a new practice added.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically right before, nine,
15 eight months before we finished the new NPDES permits
16 run-through, they specified that dewatering from the top
17 had to be done. We looked around. The one thing that
18 we could find was skimmers that were out there. The
19 biggest comments I'm getting from this is that we're
20 making people buy skimmers. We're not telling them that
21 they have to use a skimmer; we're just telling them that
22 the requirement from the EPA handed down to us under 40
23 CFR says that they have to dewater from the top. The

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 option that we were able to put into the manual was a
3 skimmer. If they can come up with another way, they are
4 more than welcome to use that way.

5 MR. DYKES: So there's a sizing table that's
6 been added for skimmers.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah. Basically there is a
8 piece in the manual which basically says if you have a
9 skimmer -- I'm giving you the short part on this, but
10 basically you need to prove that your skimmer actually
11 dewateres at the rate it says it's going to dewater.
12 Originally the group had thought, okay, this is
13 something as easy as anybody can go, get some PVC, drill
14 some holes, and make it flow the right way. Well, it's
15 not that simple. It needs to have the right buoyancy.
16 It needs to float just below the surface so it's not
17 sucking all the stuff off the top. There's a lot of
18 different calculations, orifice and head size, stuff
19 like that, that goes into account to make these things
20 work properly. So this test just basically checks to
21 make sure that it does what it says it's supposed to do.
22 That's all it is. There's not necessarily an approved
23 products list with it or anything like that. It's just

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 something for engineers to go by when they are selecting
3 a skimmer as to what they need to look for when they're
4 specifying.

5 MR. DYKES: Any comments, questions? Seeing
6 none, it's agreed to. Temporary sediment trap, Sd4.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically with the Sd4, the
8 NPDES permits specify that individual lots have to have
9 sediment storage, and sometimes you can have a lot
10 that's as small as a quarter of an acre, maybe even
11 smaller if you're within a common development. They
12 were wanting other forms of ways to come up with
13 sediment storage than just your traditional Sd3 or
14 retrofit because they needed other applications for
15 their small sites. So in looking around, the committee
16 had come up with this detail from, I believe, Knoxville,
17 Tennessee, and liked what they were seeing and decided
18 they wanted that in the manual as an option for sediment
19 storage for those smaller sites.

20 MR. DYKES: That's on Page 237. Any
21 comments? Seeing none, agreed. Slope stabilization
22 we've already discussed. Seep berm, a new BMP that was
23 also added.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: With this one basically there
3 was a lot of work done in existing studies from the
4 original TAPC, which I believe started at around 2000 or
5 something like that. There were studies done in dirt
6 one and dirt two techniques by Dr. Richard Warner, I
7 think out of Kentucky. I might have the area wrong.
8 But they did some studies here in Georgia, as well as
9 some other states, on seep berms and their
10 effectiveness, and from there the generic BMP of the
11 seep berm was put into the manual to allow for the
12 two-year, 24-hour flow to seep through the berm while
13 allowing larger discharges to go through intermediate
14 dykes flowing into a sediment storage area. I don't
15 know if I'm saying that a hundred percent correctly, but
16 it has to flow to some kind of area. The exact wording
17 is in the manual.

18 MR. DYKES: On Page 249.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the things about the
20 seep berm is that it could be allowed to be left in
21 place to be utilized as a walking trail for the future.
22 It doesn't necessarily have to be taken out, but it
23 still has to meet the definition of final stabilization

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 and all that stuff as far as the 70 percent density with
3 a hundred percent stabilization. Same as the NPDES
4 permits.

5 MR. DYKES: Seeing none, it's agree to.
6 Turbidity curtain is an additional practice, new
7 practice, Page 271.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: So the turbidity curtain
9 basically was not to do away with any of the existing
10 practices that people are using; it's just put in there
11 as an option for people to use if they are working
12 within the flow of water or on a stream buffer
13 restoration project. It doesn't stop them from having
14 to get the necessary permits or variances, but it could
15 also be used in applications in sediment ponds and stuff
16 like that where maybe you would want to use it as a
17 forebay or something like that where you don't have the
18 traditional state water as well. Just another option
19 for designers to use if it were to be used, and it has
20 all the stuff in there to say that you have to go
21 through all the necessary permits and variances in order
22 to use it if you are using it in state waters or in a
23 buffer.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: Discussion? Seeing none, it's
3 approved. The last new practice added, tree protection,
4 Page 277.

5 MR. RUZOWICZ: Originally we didn't have a
6 write-up for this in our manual. Through public comment
7 we had gotten a bunch of comments that trees conserve
8 soil and water and all that other kind of stuff, that we
9 need to add tree protection to it. In doing that, we
10 went back and looked, and Savannah had a pretty
11 stringent tree ordinance, and worked with some other
12 people and got a generic write-up that if somebody
13 chooses to use this as a BMP, they can use it; if they
14 choose not, they don't have to.

15 MR. DYKES: Any discussion? Seeing none,
16 it's agreed to. That completes all the new practices
17 and changes from the 5th Edition to the 6th that we've
18 gone through. Is there any other discussion matters as
19 it relates to the manual? I'm committed to giving you a
20 second go at it if there's something that concerns you.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the comments that we had
22 received is that brush barriers was a new BMP that was
23 added into the manual, and that was previously there in

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the 5th Edition. It wasn't anything that we made up or
3 added new. We were just taking what was in the existing
4 5th Edition.

5 MR. DYKES: Any other discussion on this
6 manual?

7 MR. FAUCETTE: Related to the statistical
8 analysis of the P Factor we should probably put a time
9 frame on when that will be done, discussed, or permitted
10 or whatever.

11 MS. JORDAN: It won't take that long to do.

12 MR. DYKES: We'll work with the proper folks
13 to get it done. That's a small matter compared to the
14 other matters. Any other comments? Okay, Item 4,
15 discussion on comments or issues expressed to date
16 through the public comment period regarding the BMP
17 testing methods or testing results. Is there any
18 matters that we haven't discussed today or that we have
19 discussed regarding the testing or the results that
20 committee members would like to bring forward? Anything
21 else?

22 Seeing nothing, we'll move to Item 5,
23 consideration and discussion on third-party review of

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 BMP testing methods and testing results. Comments from
3 the committee on a third-party review?

4 MS. JORDAN: No. I think we've hashed that
5 out pretty thoroughly.

6 MR. DYKES: Anybody else? Okay. All right.
7 We'll move to public comment. We'll go straight down
8 the list as signed up. First on the list is Robert
9 Page, C-POP Systems.

10 MR. PAGE: I just wanted clarification on what
11 can and can't be used on the sediment barriers. I got
12 lost in the Type A, Type C, Type B, compost sock. I
13 kind of got lost.

14 MS. JORDAN: Everything that was tested is
15 approved for both sensitive and nonsensitive
16 applications. Everything that's on the DOT qualified
17 product list is approved for a period of three years as
18 nonsensitive with the exception of Type C silt fence,
19 which is approved for three years for sensitive and
20 nonsensitive applications.

21 MR. PAGE: So will you put like Type A in a
22 sensitive application for three years or not?

23 MS. JORDAN: Only if it was one of the tested

180

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 products.

3 MR. FAUCETTE: If it met the criteria.

4 MS. JORDAN: Yes. We haven't done the
5 calculation yet based on the --

6 MR. PAGE: Some of Type A products that were
7 tested did not have a backing or did not have a proper
8 size post, according to the sensitive specs that I saw.
9 Spacing was off a couple of feet. And I was just
10 wondering, if I sell a product, if someone asks for a
11 roll of C-POP, which is this cost, and a roll of Type A,
12 which is this cost, are they allowed, being as a roll of
13 Type A was tested during this test on 6-foot centers, I
14 would assume with an inch-and-a-half post, are they
15 allowed to buy that product to put in a sensitive area
16 or are they still required to go with the traditional
17 Type C method, whether it be a C system or wire back or
18 4-foot centers? Because to my knowledge, and I don't
19 know if Mr. Moran can answer this, but any of the Type
20 A's, from what I saw they were tested on 6-foot centers,
21 not 4-foot centers. When a customer comes in and wants
22 to purchase product, I want to be able to give them what
23 they are asking for, and I want to know that I'm not

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 going to get my customers in trouble by selling them the
3 incorrect product. So can Type A centers with no
4 support on inch-and-a-half posts go in a sensitive area?
5 That is what it is currently approved for.

6 MR. DYKES: As listed in the manual it has to
7 be on 4-foot centers to be in a sensitive application.
8 So 6-foot would not work.

9 MR. PAGE: That's the way it was tested.
10 That's the confusing part to me. I've heard two
11 different ways that products that were tested are
12 allowed, but yet Type C is allowed for three years. And
13 I just want to get it correct, because Type A, though it
14 passed the P Factor that was set at the .03, it was not
15 tested properly because of the spacing and the post
16 size, from what I see. And the only products that were
17 tested for sensitive measures should have been on 4-foot
18 centers. And I don't think any of the Type A's were
19 tested on 4-foot centers with a 2-by-2. I just want to,
20 here again, before I sell a roll of silt fence to my
21 customer, I want to be able to say if it fails and lo
22 and behold it dumps whatever, that I can tell them who
23 to go see about being told that it got put there.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Because I'm very confused after today. I'm lost.

3 MS. JORDAN: It needs to be installed
4 according to the Green Book for a sensitive application.

5 MR. PAGE: So the test does not hold any
6 weight according to the sensitive/nonsensitive, being as
7 it was not tested that way. That's my point. I've
8 heard that the test applies, but then on the flip side
9 I've heard Type C applies. I can't see how it can be
10 both, because the products were not tested exactly the
11 way they are going to be implemented in the field, that
12 I understand.

13 I'm not an engineer. I'm not anything. I'm
14 just a reseller and I want to get clarification. My
15 business is C-POP and that's what I do, and I sell all
16 erosion control supplies. And I want to know when my
17 customer comes in, if I sell product to him, am I going
18 to be required to put stakes, if they were on 2-foot
19 centers during the slope study, or 4-foot centers in the
20 book. I need to know how to tell my client how to
21 install his product or my product or the Type A product
22 properly, because there's two different things, I mean,
23 when you look at the videos on the slope study that's

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tested on 2-, or 3-, or whatever foot centers but the
3 book says a minimum of 4-foot, I believe, or maximum of
4 4-foot.

5 I don't know, and there might be some
6 contractors available, I don't know of any contractors
7 that will go from a 4-foot center to a 2-foot center
8 just because they think otherwise. I mean, I don't know
9 anyone that would double up on their cost like that.
10 There might be. I don't know. But it was tested, silt
11 fence products were tested in accordance to the way they
12 were built or the manufacturer's whatever, 4-foot,
13 6-foot. The stake sizes were the same. And then you
14 get into the filter logs and it appears that the stakes
15 were a little closer together, and in the checkdam they
16 were a little closer together. I just want
17 clarification so if my customer comes in, do we install
18 them according to the way they were tested or the way
19 the book says?

20 MR. WATSON: The way the book says.

21 MR. PAGE: Okay. The way the book says.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: The book says both, because you
23 guys have said that you're going to add a specification

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 in there that says per manufacturer's recommendation.

3 So the book is a recommendation, but if they can test

4 another way and prove that their product is going to

5 still perform by having a bigger post spacing, then

6 what? Then I guess that would be okay.

7 FROM THE FLOOR: Or smaller.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: Or smaller. The thing that's

9 in there is that it has to maintain 80 percent of its

10 original height. If you think your product can make it

11 for that person for whatever duration they're buying it,

12 you know, depending on how they test. If it's fair for

13 one, it's fair for all. That's all I'm saying. If one

14 person gets it, then everybody else should get it the

15 same way. The book is a recommendation, but if they

16 choose to test another way and do it another way because

17 they can, then they should have the same ability that a

18 compost filter sock or whoever else has to do their

19 stuff.

20 MR. PAGE: Ben, I'm talking about right now,

21 not going back and testing. I'm talking about today.

22 Right now with what we've done today, this very moment,

23 if I have a customer walk in the door and I'm going to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 sell them a roll of C Systems, I'm going to sell them a
3 compost filter log, or I'm going to sell them a roll of
4 Type A, and I'm going to put it on the edge of the
5 Chattahoochee, I want to know, whether it goes from \$500
6 to \$200 to \$50, am I allowed to sell them all three of
7 them, or is it just one, or is it two of them? Do you
8 have to put your stakes on 4-foot centers? Are you
9 requiring to go on 2-foot centers because that's the way
10 certain products were tested?

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: From what I've been hearing is
12 the traditional type, the A, B, and C silt fence, since
13 they're getting grandfathered in, would continue to use
14 the specifications for that three-year period. If they
15 are retested per that test, then it would be per the
16 manufacturer's installation guidelines, however they
17 were able to meet that number.

18 MR. FAUCETTE: For that test.

19 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes. For whatever test it is
20 that they chose to run. People all the time come with
21 products to DOT or us and whoever, I mean, a lot of
22 times they tell us they have a specific product and
23 they're the only one in that category. Well, the

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 reality of it is they probably fit in one of these
3 different categories somehow or another that we've been
4 talking about today.

5 MR. PAGE: Here again, I want my question
6 answered. I mean, listen. Can I use a roll of Type A
7 on a sensitive area effective when we leave here or when
8 the rules are changed or whatever? Is Type A allowed in
9 sensitive areas? The reason I'm asking, I can see I'm
10 getting frustrated, but the reason I'm concerned about
11 this is I've heard that we're going to go by the test,
12 and then I've heard we're going to go by the three-year
13 thing. I want to know whether we're going by the
14 testing, the way it was tested, which Type A passed.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: What they allowed is both for
16 that three-year period.

17 MR. PAGE: Okay. So for the three-year period
18 we can use Type A in sensitive areas or nonsensitive
19 areas as well as Type C. That's what I just heard.

20 MR. RUZOWICZ: If they had run that test.

21 MS. JORDAN: Was your Type A product one of
22 the tested products?

23 MR. PAGE: No. I don't make fabric.

187

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. WATSON: The products that you're
3 describing, were they one of the ones that were tested?

4 MR. PAGE: I believe Mr. Moran's product was
5 tested, Beltech. I think it was a Type A and a Type B
6 that was passed. If I'm not mistaken either one or both
7 passed sensitive. I can't remember. Maybe he can
8 answer.

9 MR. MORAN: Yeah, it did.

10 MR. PAGE: I think Mr. Booth also had a Type A
11 that passed sensitive and another one that did not pass
12 sensitive. I believe Mr. Moran just said yes, it did,
13 so his is a perfect example. He has a product that was
14 approved with the testing as a sensitive style silt
15 fence on 6-foot centers, and that's the way it was
16 tested and it was approved for sensitive. Can I sell it
17 for sensitive uses without any support mechanisms behind
18 it and just sell it as a roll of Type A, which is the
19 old way, which would now be a sensitive style silt fence
20 if somebody came in and wanted to buy it?

21 MR. FAUCETTE: If I understand correctly, I
22 think the answer is yes, if you're talking about that
23 product that was tested. Not any A product.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. WATSON: Not generic Type A. But talking
3 about that particular product the way that it was set
4 up, if that's the manufacturer's specifications, then
5 yes, you could.

6 MR. RUZOWICZ: Did the committee decide that
7 everybody has to go back and retest?

8 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think what I'm hearing
9 too, though, the biggest point of what I'm hearing is
10 the manual now says for sensitive it's a 4-foot spacing,
11 yet the results of what was tested is a 6-foot spacing.
12 And it goes back to what I tried to say earlier in terms
13 of remember why those were different. You didn't want
14 the whole fence failing and that sediment load going
15 into the resource. Type A, if it's approved, Type A
16 retains more water. It's got a slower flow rate. I
17 think --

18 MR. PARKER: We haven't approved Type A.

19 MR. MASTRONARDI: We have, even for a
20 sensitive area. Historically that never would have been
21 in a sensitive area.

22 MR. PARKER: But we've only approved the ones
23 that were tested for sensitive areas.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right.

3 MR. PARKER: So they're not Type A. It was a
4 Type A but now it's not Type A; it's a sensitive area
5 silt fence.

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: Fair enough. Broadly
7 speaking it's a fabric on posts and (Inaudible). To his
8 question, though, are those three that he mentioned, C,
9 nonsensitive, sensitive, and again, a compost filter
10 sock installation, any of the three are suitable to be
11 installed along the Chattahoochee. I think today that's
12 what this says. The question would be how you
13 articulate for January how short that list is, in the
14 practical sense of it. I don't know how many Type A
15 products were tested. Off the top of my head I don't
16 know that number.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: For January we have everything
18 that's in the existing Type C category.

19 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. The other part I'm
20 sensitive to, because we work in a low-bid environment,
21 if that wire backing and that labor to install and
22 attach that wire backing is more than just a roll of A
23 on post, then A is going to go up. Predominantly that's

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 what's going to go up. Cost will drive it. Even though
3 C-POP is competitive to the wire backing, A is still
4 cheaper than those. If compost filter sock is cheaper
5 yet, that's going to go up. That would be the item that
6 gets used. I think the question is fair. It's nothing
7 more than are we all aware that that's what we're doing.

8 MR. DYKES: The detail on Page 194 says
9 sensitive has to have some type of backing, if it's a
10 silt fence, on Page 194.

11 MR. MASTRONARDI: So maybe those manufacturers
12 that see their product need to understand it has
13 additional requirements?

14 MR. DYKES: I think that's what we're
15 discussing. The schematic as presented shows a backing.
16 Woven wire fence or alternative backing of a silt fence
17 is type sensitive.

18 MR. PAGE: What is the alternative backing?

19 MR. DYKES: It just says alternative backing.
20 It could be made of --

21 MR. PAGE: It would go back through the
22 retesting process, I guess, because as far as Type A's
23 go, and here again I might be incorrect, I don't think I

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 am, but I do not believe there were any Type A or B
3 fabrics tested on a 4-foot center with any type of
4 support mechanism behind it, whether it be wire or on
5 alternative backing, nor were any of them tested with a
6 2-by-2 post, which is also in the specifications. they
7 were all tested according to the old method, which was
8 A, B, C. That's the only thing that I'm wanting to be
9 very clear on for me.

10 Just like Marc just mentioned, Type A is the
11 lower price of everything in my world, in the silt fence
12 world. Compost sock, I don't really know, but Type A,
13 especially without backing and the smaller posts on the
14 centers that it was tested on, is considerably cheaper
15 than the product I currently make. And I want to make
16 sure that when they come and they typically, and I'm
17 just speaking as of today, would call in an order for
18 ten pallets of C-POP, now am I allowed to give them five
19 pallets of Type A at a third the price with no backing?
20 That's the way it was tested. That's the part I'm
21 confused about.

22 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the point is we're
23 no longer looking at the test in terms of other than

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 saying it established the factor. The manual does say,
3 to Brent's point, it doesn't define a post dimension but
4 it does define it has to have a backing system. That
5 being the case, it does sound like those products
6 wouldn't be able to go out today without additional
7 testing.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: What I see for post sizing, it
9 has it on 6-197.

10 MR. PAGE: What does it say, Ben?

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: It says nonsensitive should be
12 1.5 by 1.5, 1.3 pounds per foot, 3-inch diameter or a
13 2-by-4, and that sensitive shall be 1.3 pounds per foot
14 minimum and a 2-by-2.

15 MR. PAGE: And that's the part I want. I
16 understand where we are with this. If it was not tested
17 according to the way the book says, am I now required,
18 if I sell a roll of Mr. Moran's fence, to attach some
19 form of backing and reduce the spacing to 4-foot and put
20 a 2-by-2 on it before I'm allowed to sell it?

21 MR. DYKES: Yes.

22 MR. PAGE: Am I required to have it retested
23 prior to using it?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. JORDAN: Not within the next three years.

3 MR. DYKES: By the end of three years.

4 MS. JORDAN: By the end of three years it does
5 have to be retested, but you can use the designated type
6 post size and you can add the backing to Type A, and for
7 the next three years you can use that.

8 MR. PAGE: So the backing that I'm currently
9 using for my product, is it an approved alternative
10 backing where I can put it on a piece of Type A that was
11 passed and sell the product? It was used in some of the
12 Type C testing through the C Systems. So when it breaks
13 down to where you either have to have a wire behind it
14 or the, I don't remember the word, alternative, approved
15 alternative backing, the backing that I currently use on
16 my products, what I'm hearing, is I can take my backing
17 and put it on a piece of Type A that was approved or
18 Type B that was approved, bring the spacings where
19 they're supposed to be, and it is automatically an
20 approved product. And then over the course of the next
21 36 months I'm required to go have it tested. Is that
22 correct?

23 MR. MASTRONARDI: That sounds right.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. PAGE: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. RUZOWICZ: I just want to say one thing.

4 From the last meeting there was a public comment that
5 was made to change the specification on post size from
6 1.3 to 1.15 pounds per foot to match what the DOT had
7 changed theirs to, and everybody had decided that that
8 was good. And I said what was in the manual, but
9 through the public comments sheet that I've got here
10 that change is supposed to be made to the specification,
11 1.15 pounds per foot.

12 MR. DYKES: Instead of 1.3.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

14 MR. DYKES: Next comment, Mr. Don Davis.

15 MR. DAVIS: Snooky touched on something I was
16 going to talk about, but my thing is the DOT, they want
17 a certain strength. They want AOS's water flows to be a
18 certain thing. Are we going to change -- I mean, it has
19 to be a mano mano. Can we change to a tape tape, I
20 mean, make it as weak as we want? I don't understand
21 some things that's going on, but like the Type A can
22 pass. Does it still have to be a mano tape? Is that
23 taken out of the drawings? Can we use a tape tape? I

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 mean, all we have to do is pass that test is what y'all
3 are saying? I've been in the silt fence business for a
4 long time. Y'all are leaving yourself up for some bad
5 things: 60 gram, 50 gram, cheap. You went away from
6 your strengths, everything. Just pass the test.
7 Anybody got a clue? Bob, am I wrong?

8 MR. MORAN: I thought there was a strength
9 requirement.

10 MR. DAVIS: I thought all we have to do is
11 past the test is what we heard today. That's what we
12 just heard a minute ago.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: We had discussed this in the
14 last previous --

15 MR. DAVIS: Just a minute ago you said all we
16 have to do is pass that test.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: In the previous meetings or
18 times before this we had talked about this and having a
19 specification for just silt fence to have a strength
20 test and then not having it for a compost filter sock,
21 because they don't have the same index properties or
22 something like that. How fair is that? We've gone
23 around and around about that. That's why they went back

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 in there and put that has to be maintain 80 percent of
3 the height. It wasn't any individual specifications
4 other than we're taking index properties (Inaudible).

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the concern is where
6 the department may still maintain a certain number of
7 specs that we would require, if there's nothing else
8 said elsewhere, it would simply be pass the test, the
9 concern being the product may be cheapened over time.

10 MR. DAVIS: Type C was made for safety, if I
11 recall right, because you got a high water flow and you
12 got traffic on the highways. If you back up traffic
13 using a tape tape and the water gets out there, someone
14 gets in a wreck, who is responsible for that?

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: Silt fence, as far as I know,
16 should be placed in sheet flow applications.

17 MR. DAVIS: What about DOT applications?

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: They should be placing their
19 silt fence in sheet flow applications. If they're using
20 it for an inlet protection, that's a different story.
21 That's why there's parameters set forth for allowing
22 different things or possibly not even having it at all.

23 MR. DAVIS: But you just said if we could pass

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the test, we could use it for sensitive, all we have to
3 do is pass that test.

4 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

5 MR. DAVIS: So are we going to be allowed to
6 use it on a sensitive area on the highway?

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: You're talking about ponding.
8 I'm just saying if you're using it as sheet flow
9 application, you're not going to have a concentrated
10 flow.

11 MR. DAVIS: Am I right on that, Marc?

12 MR. MASTRONARDI: You are. Your concerns are
13 valid concerns. I think the challenge to everybody is
14 whether or not you know today what those risks are, how
15 big they are.

16 MR. DAVIS: My other thing is silt fence could
17 be modified to what you guys want, and we're taking a
18 test that costs \$6500. We can make a silt fence the way
19 you want it, the water flow you want. Maybe it's not
20 70, because that's what y'all wanted us to meet was the
21 70 water flow. We can lower that, tweak it, and you
22 guys can do the test and see if it does the results.
23 Give us the results you want and we can make a fabric to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 match up to where you're at, what you want, instead of
3 every silt fence company catered to a new product. I
4 mean, that seems like what we're doing right now. The
5 silt fence industry is catering to new products. You
6 can actually do your test one time and make us in an
7 envelope per se. Take the water flow, the AOS's that
8 you want. We all do the same. All our fabrics are made
9 the same. They have to be mano mano, mano tape,
10 whatever, instead of every company single doing a \$6500
11 test. That's just ridiculous to me. That's all I've
12 got.

13 MR. DYKES: Next, Kelli Davis.

14 MS. DAVIS: The first thing I wanted to talk
15 about was the checkdams. When you guys first brought it
16 up, you talked about there really weren't that many
17 issues with it. There were some issues that were
18 brought up in the past that I wanted to kind of mention
19 to you. On the rock and stone checkdams, it was brought
20 up that in the test we used an 8-ounce nonwoven fabric.
21 Currently Georgia DOT would probably fail you if you
22 used an 8-ounce nonwoven fabric. How do you address
23 that? How does the community move forward with that?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Do you use a typical riprap fabric that has been being
3 used by the Georgia DOT or do you go with what your
4 recommendation says or what your test was, and it was
5 8-ounce nonwoven? We really need clarification on that
6 because we do get requests for that in our industry a
7 lot, and you guys need to make that decision for us, let
8 us know what is acceptable, what is not acceptable, will
9 our product pass for the DOT if the Green Book says
10 something different.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: Are you referring to the fabric
12 that goes under the rock?

13 MS. DAVIS: Correct. You guys used an 8-ounce
14 nonwoven fabric in the test. I believe Joel said it
15 when he had it up on his film, I think it was in
16 September, that that was just an oversight.

17 MR. RUZOWICZ: The manual specifies AASHTO
18 M288. As far as I know M288 allows both woven and
19 nonwoven fabric.

20 MS. DAVIS: But Georgia DOT does not.

21 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. We're not Georgia DOT.
22 I mean, I'm just saying we've had that specification in
23 there for a while.

200

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MS. DAVIS: From what I understand by the code
3 in Georgia, Georgia Soil and Water determines what
4 Georgia DOT will do or will accept, so you guys do have
5 a pretty important role in this as far as Georgia DOT
6 goes. We kind of need to know how do we direct our
7 customers on that. They call up and they say I need
8 riprap fabric. That's what they tell us. A lot of
9 contractors may not know, but we as a person, a company
10 who sells the product, we need to know what's going to
11 pass for Georgia DOT and what's going to pass for
12 Georgia Soil and Water. Is it one and the same? Is it
13 something totally different?

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: The DOT, like every local
15 issuing authority, has the ability to be more stringent.
16 I think in this case that might be the case where the
17 DOT has a more stringent requirement than what the
18 traditional AASHTO M288 specification has in it.

19 MS. DAVIS: Okay. And another question on the
20 checkdam application. Hay bales were rejected. I think
21 you came up with a better installation method and it
22 worked. Silt fence was installed as far as a Type W
23 application. I would like to see, if there is going to

201

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 be any type of retest, if we could retest C and B
3 applications. I know it depends on the channels, but if
4 there can be an adjustment made for a blowout, I think
5 there should be an adjustment made in the design, in the
6 installed application design. Is that a problem with
7 any of you?

8 MR. DYKES: I think the commission would look
9 to the DOT for a recommendation what to do there. The
10 only reason we tested that energy dissipator was because
11 DOT requested it to be done. If the DOT wants to test
12 it in a different way, we'll let the DOT.

13 MS. DAVIS: Well, again, in Georgia code
14 Georgia Soil and Water tells Georgia DOT what to do, and
15 as soon as this test was done, this application was
16 yanked completely, whether it was W shaped or V shaped,
17 from the state of Georgia as far as silt fence being
18 used in that application. We got the letter that went
19 out all through the state. All the contractors got it.
20 And it's very confusing to us as a manufacturer if you
21 install it in one way and it actually encompasses all
22 applications. Am I saying that where you can understand
23 what I'm saying?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: I understand, but that was an
3 issue between DOT and EPD and they'll need to answer
4 that. That wasn't a commission letter.

5 MS. DAVIS: All right. Another thing. Ben,
6 you suggested that blowouts should not be taken into
7 consideration. Did I understand that correctly?

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes. You had brought it up,
9 other people had brought it up, that the definition of a
10 blowout wasn't defined.

11 MS. DAVIS: Okay. From other testing labs,
12 not just TRI, but I'm saying from other testing labs out
13 there, typically if there's a blowout, there's a product
14 failure or installation failure, and either way it needs
15 to be addressed. So it shouldn't be eliminated. It
16 should be taken into consideration. If it's an
17 installation error, typically the testing lab, from what
18 I've been told, will stop the process, fix their
19 installation error, repack the dirt or whatever it
20 requires to start the test over, and redo it. It would
21 be on their dime because it's their installation issue.
22 But if it's a product failure, that needs to also be
23 identified, because if it doesn't work acceptable on a

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 test plot, how do you expect it to work on a real-world
3 application? Those are my thoughts on that, and I'd
4 like some input if you don't mind to help me understand
5 that.

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: I think, as I understand
7 that, it would be a matter of the material that passes
8 through that blowout, so to speak, would likely be what
9 leads to its failure. Rather than stopping the test and
10 saying there's no way it's going to pass, actually let
11 it perform and see what that is. That's my
12 understanding of what in fact determines what that would
13 do to continue a test.

14 MR. RUZOWICZ: Even if it does, I mean, the
15 number is going to tell us stuff, regardless of what
16 happens, without having to define it.

17 MR. MASTRONARDI: But I think the question
18 being do we mean that -- I mean, is it okay if a product
19 fails or blows out? I'm sitting in the seat of that's
20 the product, that was us that it blew out, and we didn't
21 get any more test data from it as a silt fence checkdam.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm going off memory. From
23 what I remember it was around point, around 55 or

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 something like that, even blowing out and redoing it. I
3 don't know if I'm right. I know the first couple of
4 times it was over a hundred, but I don't know that a
5 blowout would be able to meet the 30 percent.

6 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. But is the take-away
7 for the industry that it's not that there is no
8 recognition of the blowout; it's that those test results
9 will demonstrate the number? Is that what we're saying?
10 Demonstrate pass/fall.

11 MR. RUZOWICZ: That was my thought, that those
12 results would demonstrate pass or fail.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: The likelihood that you have
14 a blowout and it's going to pass, I don't know that.

15 MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't know either. I was
16 just trying to think of a way, you know, everybody had a
17 problem with it, to come up with another way.

18 MS. DAVIS: Excuse me for interrupting, but if
19 the other testing labs in the industry recognize a
20 blowout as a failure and this particular committee
21 chooses to not recognize a blowout as a failure, then
22 we're not apples to apples here. So when our company,
23 who is based out of the state of Georgia and we hire

205

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Georgia people and we work in Georgia for Georgia and we
3 are pushing for Georgia to be a great state in this
4 thing, if we try to put a product, the same product in
5 Georgia in another state, per se, using the same
6 criteria, we are probably going to fail. If it's tested
7 apples to apples, then you know that you're getting the
8 same thing. But if you're testing one way in one state
9 and you're expecting that product to do well everywhere
10 -- Georgia has just got to make up its mind, I think. I
11 think that's the thing. This is a pretty serious deal
12 in our industry, and it's not just our industry. It's
13 actually statewide. I don't want to see anybody's
14 product fail. I don't. I really don't. But if you're
15 going to test it, it needs to have something that people
16 can actually follow and understand in every testing lab.
17 If the testing lab says blowouts don't matter or if this
18 technical committee says blowouts don't matter that
19 every other testing lab in the nation says it does, what
20 are you saying for the state of Georgia?

21 I can move on to the next thing I have. Type
22 A and Type B silt fence are the same construction. One
23 is taller; one is shorter. Is that right, Bob?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MORAN: Yes.

3 MS. DAVIS: If you test Type B silt fence or
4 if you test Type A silt fence, would it not
5 automatically qualify for the same thing as Type B?

6 MR. MORAN: It wouldn't qualify because it's
7 not the same type.

8 MS. DAVIS: If you tested Type B in this type
9 of testing and it passed, my thoughts are, and I may be
10 wrong on this, but my thoughts are that if you test Type
11 B and it passes, would not Type A also pass?

12 MR. MORAN: It shouldn't.

13 MS. DAVIS: And then you would only have to
14 test one fabric versus two, but you would qualify for
15 both A and B application. That's just a thought. You
16 guys can talk about that.

17 You said there would be a cert letter that
18 would have to be submitted in the three-year period. Is
19 that cert letter going to be going for Georgia Soil and
20 Water or is it going to be going to NTPEP? Because from
21 what I understand, you're moving towards being a NTPEP
22 member state as far as following their criteria. So
23 we'd have to be audited by currently TRI, and they would

207

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 determine whether or not we pass or fail the audit. But
3 would our cert letter be contingent upon that type of
4 audit from TRI or whoever the current testing lab is at
5 that time for NTPEP, or does the cert letter just go
6 directly to Georgia Soil and Water and say we are
7 self-certifying that we do meet your criteria and have
8 not changed our application?

9 MR. RUZOWICZ: From what I know for the test
10 method, we just specified third party. It didn't say
11 that it had to be through that test.

12 MS. DAVIS: Who are you certifying to?

13 MR. DYKES: The commission.

14 MS. DAVIS: Are you going to wire NTPEP?

15 MR. DYKES: We're just saying approved lab.
16 That's all it says to this point.

17 MS. DAVIS: Are the university systems going
18 to be included in that?

19 MR. DYKES: If they can prove they're an
20 approved lab, yes.

21 MS. DAVIS: Would they have to certify through
22 Georgia Soil and Water for that, or the national
23 program?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. DYKES: It wouldn't be certified through
3 us because we don't certify testing entities.

4 MS. DAVIS: All right. In the report, the
5 final TRI report that was published back in 2012, it
6 states in the scope of the testing where it breaks down
7 in the back of the report, where it breaks down sediment
8 barrier testing and it breaks down the channel testing,
9 it tells what's being followed, what test method is
10 being followed, and it does reflect ASTM WK 11340 in
11 that, in the very front page. I know today we said
12 we're doing a modified version of that, but that is what
13 the test method is reflecting in the report itself.
14 From what I saw, it doesn't say modified. It says ASTM
15 WK 11340, which, as I understand it, is a working test
16 method that's been in process for about 12 years with
17 ASTM. For Georgia to change its whole everything and
18 based on these test methods, for ASTM to have been
19 working on it for 12 years and it not have been passed
20 yet, that's kind of a scary thing because you're basing
21 it on something that's not truly been proven science.
22 They're still working on it. That's what the WK stands
23 for. So I would like you guys to consider that as well.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 We talked about the Bentonite, and the test
3 itself says that we are trying to determine these
4 products, determine a benchmark for these products based
5 off of real-world applications, if I'm correct.
6 Bentonite is typically not used in the field, whether
7 it's on filter socks or whether it's on silt fence. So
8 if we install as per the test, then that means everybody
9 that puts in silt fence will be spreading Bentonite at
10 the bottom. Everybody who puts in a filter log or
11 compost log will be spreading Bentonite at the bottom,
12 because you'll get the same applications. If you say it
13 doesn't really make a difference, it does make a
14 difference, because if you noticed during the blowouts
15 the lady was continuously trying to fill the hole, to
16 plug up the hole where the blowouts were occurring.
17 It's a sealant. It swells. It blocks. So to say that
18 it doesn't matter is not an actually correct statement,
19 in my interpretation, because as a sealant, if you're
20 blocking any type of flow, then you're altering your
21 test. You're making that part of the application. So
22 are we going to apply the Bentonite --

23 FROM THE FLOOR: Why don't you test without

210

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 the Bentonite?

3 MS. DAVIS: I think the first nine products
4 were tested without the Bentonite; the last four
5 products tested were with the Bentonite. If you're
6 going to say you're not testing it for one, then why are
7 you testing it with the other?

8 FROM THE FLOOR: You have to go to the test
9 facility to understand that. Installation is important
10 to make the test work just to get data. So go up there
11 and test it. Just take a crew up there and get it
12 tested. That's silly. I'm sorry. You hear it over and
13 over again. Testing, you have to get data. You have to
14 install certain ways.

15 MS. DAVIS: The very first test, if I may, if
16 you don't mind, the very first test that was done, the
17 very first series of tests that was done, the testing
18 lab said on video we will not be using that Bentonite
19 stuff anymore. They said it. I didn't say that. So we
20 are wondering why was it re-added. I'm okay if they
21 want to test every single person's product with the
22 Bentonite, that's fine because we'll all get the same
23 type of results. But if you don't and you're trying to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 tell everybody to base it off of real-world
3 applications, that's not real world. That is our point.
4 I'm just saying it.

5 There's repeatability issues. As Mr. Page
6 brought up a while ago, Mr. Larry Booth of Willagoochie
7 Industrial Fabrics makes a lot of geotextile for across
8 the industry. He had two series of Type A products that
9 were tested within this test. One passed and one
10 failed. The repeatability is not something that has
11 been proven with this test method. Again, we ask you to
12 reconsider using any results from this 11340 test based
13 off of all the repeatability issues that have been
14 brought up. But you cannot tell one manufacturer you've
15 got this same product and it passed here and it failed
16 here. That is such confusion. It basically looks like
17 you are picking winners and losers.

18 MR. RUZOWICZ: So what you're saying is the
19 same product was installed twice but got different
20 results.

21 MS. DAVIS: Yes.

22 MR. RUZOWICZ: I think one of the things that
23 they showed is that those products had different

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 flow-through rates so they weren't exactly made the same
3 and had different index properties. So it showed they
4 weren't exactly the same product to start with.

5 MS. DAVIS: The index properties, I would kind
6 of beg to differ a little bit, because our product was
7 also tested with index properties along with another
8 product. We both got different test results. And I
9 called Sam Allen out of TRI a few months back and I
10 asked him, I said, "If you're going to test our product
11 and it's a fully assembled product that's got the
12 netting on the back, how would you test it?" And he
13 said, "We would prefer to receive it without the
14 netting." And I said, "But if we sent it in and it was
15 fully assembled, how would you test it?" And he said,
16 "We would cut the netting off." So any type of error,
17 any type of slip of the knife or any type of cutting of
18 anything can alter the properties.

19 Our index properties on that particular test
20 were not even close to being consistent with what TRI,
21 who does all of our testing in the past, who does
22 everything for us, they have come up with way different
23 results on that one. So the only thing I'm left to

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 assume as a manufacturer is maybe my product was cut.

3 That's the only thing I can think of, because the water

4 flow went up to I think 170 gallons per minute. Ours

5 has never done that before. Only thing that would do

6 that was to have a wider opening of the fabric.

7 There were a lot of critical errors that were

8 brought to light in the last few months to you guys as a

9 committee. There was a lot of taxpayer dollars put in

10 this, federal taxpayer dollars. After two years it just

11 seems like -- you guys were just now getting the videos

12 to review at the last meeting -- that there might have

13 been some stuff put in there that you guys just didn't

14 realize. We would just like you, as the industry, we'd

15 like to ask you just to reconsider moving this thing

16 forward, just based off of everything that's come to

17 light. That's all I have, and I appreciate your time.

18 MR. DYKES: Next is Joel Sprague.

19 MR. SPRAGUE: I just wanted to make myself

20 available if there were questions about the testing.

21 Other than that, I have nothing to add.

22 MR. DYKES: Next is Roger Singleton. Okay.

23 That's all that signed up for public comment. Yes, sir,

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Mr. Page. If you don't mind stepping up here.

3 MR. PAGE: Also back to the silt fence
4 question, there was I believe a Type B product, either
5 one or two that were tested, that also passed sensitive.
6 So the Type B product will also be able to be used just
7 like the Type A. I'm just asking, because it's also a
8 price, there's another price issue when you're cutting a
9 foot off the top. So Ben might have the old approved P
10 Factor results, but if I'm not mistaken, the Type B as
11 well passed the .030. Is that correct, Ben? I didn't
12 know I was going to do all this. I apologize. I would
13 have brought everything with me. Here again, if I'm not
14 mistaken, a Type B fabric, which I'm not a manufacturer,
15 but it passed the sensitive needs just like the Type A.
16 In accordance to what I heard through my last
17 questioning was the Type A works, so I just want to make
18 sure that Type B will work as well on 4-foot centers
19 2-by-2 with the backing sewn on, because it was approved
20 in the exact same manner as the Type A.

21 MR. DYKES: No, it wouldn't, because it's not
22 48 inches high, and the specs in the manual says it has
23 to be a 48-inch product. So the Type B cannot be used

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 for sensitive application.

3 MR. PAGE: And Type A being 36 inches, it's
4 not 48.

5 MR. DYKES: It would have to be 48 also,
6 because the spec calls for 48 inches.

7 MR. MASTRONARDI: It's 30 above ground.

8 MR. DYKES: I'm sorry. I misread that. I
9 apologize. I was misreading the spec.

10 MR. MASTRONARDI: It says the height is to be
11 shown on the sedimentation and erosion control plan. I
12 have heard that question myself on would there be a
13 minimum height required by the commission.

14 MR. DYKES: Yes. 36 inches.

15 MR. PAGE: So Type B cannot be used.

16 MR. DYKES: No, sir.

17 MR. PAGE: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. DYKES: Other matters, questions,
20 comments, or recommendations from the committee at this
21 time?

22 MR. MASTRONARDI: I do have a comment. in
23 terms of the, I guess, on the insurance test, just an

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 overview, what the department will do is we do lot
3 samples and we also do random samples where we'll take
4 product from the side of the road from the project,
5 bring it back to our physical lab, and we'll test it.
6 We're not going to be in the process but what we do is
7 an ASTM flow-through test. I can't quote you the
8 number. But my understanding is there will be nothing
9 to govern that? I mean, as far as across that
10 three-year period it's a piece of paper that says I
11 promise I'm doing it right. Is there any other
12 mechanisms that looks at quality assurance, quality
13 control?

14 MR. DYKES: At this point, no. Nothing has
15 been recommended, Marc. It's up for discussion.

16 MR. RUZOWICZ: We talked about it, but where's
17 the money to come from for somebody to go around and
18 inspect all this stuff the whole time? It gets to be
19 really big.

20 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. I think the
21 challenge would be if the -- I hesitate to say this, but
22 I think the challenge would be if I were found to be in
23 noncompliance by the EPD, then I would be challenging my

217

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 fabric. Someone is going to be paying for it
3 eventually. That will be the question somewhere down
4 the road. They'll be looking back at that issue. Or
5 you'll just hang your hat on the fact you have a
6 certification statement.

7 MR. RUZOWICZ: Might be no different than what
8 happens today as far as people selling stuff that's not
9 Type C as Type C.

10 MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. My point is,
11 internally for us we have that ability to go grab a
12 piece of fabric and do that.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: We do have index properties for
14 the ones that we did test, so those still are there, so
15 you could still go back and check the index properties
16 to see if they were close to what we had previously
17 tested for this stuff. And we do have a mass and areas,
18 whatever, for compost socks. So as new BMPs come up, we
19 might be able to come up with some new index. That's
20 all I can think of for those plans kind of thing.

21 MR. MASTRONARDI: I was just thinking about
22 the variability. We have unfortunately found issues
23 where we've had to remove a lot of fence and reinstall.

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. RUZOWICZ: Again, it happens to people all
3 the time out there now with the traditional Types A, B,
4 and C that they have. Sometimes they get sold the wrong
5 thing by the wrong person or they buy the wrong thing.
6 I don't know.

7 MR. SPRAGUE: Might I make one comment? Most
8 of your Georgia manufacturers aren't NTPEP companies, so
9 Willacoochee, Belton, Propex, they're all, if that
10 requirement were simply added, then you've got specifics
11 materials that in essence you can track back to, and
12 there's some built-in QA.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: So by specifying NTPEP we get
14 that thing you're talking about without having to pay
15 for additional stuff, so that would be a benefit of
16 going through NTPEP.

17 MR. DYKES: Other comments, recommendations?

18 MR. MORAN: One of the things that is done now
19 for DOT fabric, there's WINFAB or Belton, whatever, is
20 printed on the silt fence. Are you going to print
21 sensitive or nonsensitive, whatever it's going to be, on
22 the silt fence before you can install it?

23 MR. RUZOWICZ: The specification in the manual

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 is that they had to print their, whatever it was, every
3 so many feet, and then per application, whether they are
4 sensitive or nonsensitive, put them into that category,
5 not that they had to print it on the thing. Let's see
6 what it says.

7 MR. MORAN: While you're looking that up,
8 there really needs to be a strength requirement on a
9 silt fence, whether it's NTPEP classification silt fence
10 or it's Georgia DOT. I think you have to have that on
11 there and have it fall in with a certain category or
12 what have you. You have it on this thing.

13 MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. I understand, and we
14 had talked about that before: Is it fair to have it for
15 silt fence and to not have it for another BMP? So
16 that's what the group had struggled with. I'm fine with
17 telling all silt fence you got to have all these index
18 properties and these apparent opening sizes too, but
19 then over here you got maybe a compost filter sock that
20 doesn't have all those index properties because they
21 haven't applied to. Is that fair? And that's what we
22 struggled with the whole first round. So, I mean, yes,
23 I'm good with leaving all the index properties in for

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 sediment barriers. That's no problem. But is it fair
3 to have it for one and not for something else that
4 doesn't have those same applications?

5 MR. MASTRONARDI: But again, we're not testing
6 for the same things you test compost filter socks for
7 either.

8 MR. RUZOWICZ: True.

9 MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't know if fairness is
10 the right thing. I think the concern that was mentioned
11 in terms of -- you know, again, if you're producing
12 miles of fabric and we can remove two or three strands,
13 that amounts to something at the end. You may never see
14 it. It takes maybe one odd catch that somebody finds
15 that mistake is there. But if there is nothing to speak
16 to that, you do run that risk of finding out too late.

17 I think the other part, when I listen to this,
18 is just as it has been in the past, the DOT will
19 probably still carve up a way that we'll do things. It
20 may be very similar to what we're doing today.

21 MR. FAUCETTE: Marc or Bob, do you have a
22 recommendation as to what that should be, the tensile
23 strength, or keep what you have?

221

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 MR. MORAN: You test the DOT silt fence, not
3 that this was the greatest test, but it's the test,
4 right? And NTPEP, based upon that e-mail I got the
5 other day that I shared, they are offering as part of
6 their basket of testing the 11340, right? To me it's
7 sort of up to the manufacturer. If you make whatever it
8 is and you say okay, Georgia requires 11340, do I want
9 to test X number of silt fences, to use that as an
10 example, or whatever it would be, to make sure I come up
11 with one that's sensitive or nonsensitive.

12 I still think in the long run you're going to
13 find that NTPEP, AASHTO, whatever, is kind of the
14 800-pound gorilla in the room, if you will. And based
15 on the manufacturer's standpoint, because we don't want
16 to make 48 silt fences for 48 states, but we will make
17 something that meets what the state requires based upon
18 the results they get through NTPEP. A good example is
19 Virginia. I used that before. They have a specific
20 requirement in terms of NTPEP as far as physical
21 properties, tensile, and so forth, but then they also
22 have a performance test which is the index test 5141.
23 So that's not a problem. I don't have any problem with

222

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 that and we'll do that testing. They require it every
3 230,000 square feet, which is not a lot of silt fence.
4 So we do that.

5 But NTPEP to me is the big dog. When you put
6 up that chart the other day, it was 24, 25, 26 states,
7 and even more and more states I think were going to it
8 at least for physical properties. They may not go for
9 performance but they'll do their own thing maybe. I
10 think we're kind of missing the boat. Fine, you want to
11 have a performance factor, that's great. I'm all for
12 performance factors, but I think it's got to work within
13 the framework of the DOT and NTPEP, and it works better,
14 at least from my standpoint as a manufacturer.

15 MR. FAUCETTE: So as far as the index test,
16 the material spec from NTPEP versus Georgia DOT, it
17 sounds like it's a little different.

18 MR. MORAN: No. Georgia DOT, here's their
19 physical properties right here, okay? Virginia doesn't
20 have the same physical properties. They just have one
21 silt fence right now. Maybe they'll go to more. Who
22 knows. Most states have sometimes two, three, four silt
23 fences and so forth. So I still have to meet these

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 properties right now, and then I submit to Georgia DOT,
3 and now you've added a P Factor, which is fine. I can
4 work around that. But I still think you need some
5 physical properties as far as strength goes on silt
6 fence because I think what the gentleman said is right.
7 I mean, to me the P Factor of .04, you probably couldn't
8 put up a 60-gram fabric. It wouldn't work. But you
9 could get some product that may or may not last. And
10 then there's also the UV factor, I mean, how long do you
11 want it to stay up on a stake? You get stuff in
12 from overseas that you can put it up and two weeks later
13 it's white. I mean, there's some physical properties
14 that I think have to be involved when you do this. And
15 that's why I mentioned in the beginning, my little
16 monologue of everything we do we do for NTPEP, for the
17 most part, and then after that it kind of filters out
18 into the states based upon what their specifications
19 are.

20 MR. FAUCETTE: Ben mentioned this already, but
21 we did discuss this a fair amount in the previous TAC
22 Committee, whether we should or shouldn't and what that
23 should be. It's a very good discussion, I think. Are

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 you recommending maybe we should keep the DOT material
3 specs as --

4 MR. MORAN: Uh-huh. And as it falls out -- I
5 mean, anybody can design a silt fence any way they want,
6 okay? It's not rocket science. We just got lucky, I'll
7 be honest with you. I had no idea I was being tested
8 for 11340. I turned it in and "poof" we passed,
9 quote/unquote we passed. So, I mean, it can be done.
10 Like I said, we make fences for different states, and
11 I'm sure the folks over here do too, but I still think
12 there needs to be some physical properties involved.

13 MR. PARKER: One of the reasons we shied away
14 from that is how do you make that fair for all types of
15 sediment barriers? If you give a physical property for
16 a silt fence with a goal of anticipating certain
17 longevity, what kind of physical property thresholds are
18 you going to come up with for other types of products
19 that we may not even know will exist yet?

20 MR. MORAN: For silt fence I think you're
21 making a mistake. If you're going to use silt fence as
22 a sediment barrier, you need some kind of physical
23 property on it or you're going to be surprised what

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 you're going to get. Maybe it will pass. I don't know.

3 But it may not be up for long.

4 MR. PARKER: This is probably being naive but
5 I would think that if a contractor installs a silt fence
6 and it deteriorates in a week and he has to come back
7 and reinstall over and over during the job, he's not
8 going to buy that product again.

9 MR. MORAN: Assuming it's being inspected on
10 the job.

11 MR. PARKER: Yes. All of this is assuming
12 that it's properly designed, installed, maintained, and
13 inspected.

14 MR. DYKES: I think that's a very important
15 point, so I'd like to hear the committee's
16 recommendation on should we add physical properties to
17 silt fence sediment barriers.

18 MR. SPRAGUE: Just as it relates to the
19 testing once again, to address this specifically, I know
20 that when a company submits to NTPEP for large-scale
21 testing, their submittal has to include physical
22 properties information that then has to go into the
23 report. So any information performance related is tied

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 to specifically what the physical properties were of
3 that material, whether it's fabric material or whether
4 it's a sock type material. So they've kind of figured
5 out which index properties those folks who make these
6 things need to report. So it may then mean that when it
7 comes time to put any kind of material on an approved
8 product list or whatever, it will come with index
9 properties that define it that could then be listed as
10 well.

11 MR. FAUCETTE: I'll just add too I think --
12 well, I think a couple of things. Based on I think what
13 Don and Bob and Marc are saying, I think I may lean
14 towards potentially putting some sort of material spec
15 in the Green Book. And I think in addition AASHTO and
16 NRCS as well does have material specs for some of these
17 other devices we could look at to add in as well.

18 MR. DYKES: Okay. All committee members in
19 favor of adding some type of physical properties for
20 silt fence as a sediment barrier raise your hand.

21 MR. WATSON: My hand is up. I have other
22 comments. Seems like it's getting away from what the
23 original direction that I was asked to be on this

227

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 committee for, which was to come up with performance
3 criteria to have new BMPs. We're going down a path, in
4 my opinion, that is taking away from what I was asked to
5 do four years ago. I mean, I agree with all this. And
6 I'm not one to say any product is better than any other
7 product. It's how do you get these new products into
8 the Green Book. That was why I was called. That's why
9 I applied. And now we're to a lot of things that, it's
10 all very good comments, but we could put all the
11 specifications in the world but then how are you going
12 to get new products into the Green Book? Seems like
13 it's a bit beyond what at least my personal committee
14 member assignment was.

15 MR. DYKES: Other comments, recommendations?

16 MR. MORAN: If your product is a silt fence,
17 you have specifications. Filter socks is what's been
18 new, is it not? It hasn't been around as long as silt
19 fence, I don't believe. I'm not that familiar with the
20 product. It was tested and it got in. So, I mean, if
21 you're filling out the form for Georgia Soil and Water,
22 you can put category whatever, and then we want to test
23 for P Factor. Normally you put down, at least we do, so

228

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 many gram tensile pounds and so forth and so on, this is
3 what we expect it to do. That's what we do for NTPEP.
4 You have to put what you expect it's going to do and how
5 it's going to perform. And then when you submit it
6 in -- and I don't know what it would be. Maybe if it's
7 something biodegradable and it lasts six months, that's
8 all you need, it performs.

9 MR. MASTRONARDI: Brian, I think that doesn't
10 take away the ability to bring something in, because you
11 are still looking for the performance result.

12 MR. WATSON: I agree.

13 MR. MASTRONARDI: To give you an example, and
14 this may sound real strange to you but this is a
15 legitimate proposal we once saw at the department that
16 was a Styrofoam sediment barrier with the perforations
17 in it at a certain elevation to drain the water through.
18 So if it met the P Factor, then you would then have to
19 at some point pull in those EPA requirements for those
20 Styrofoam constituents, whatever is comprised of that.
21 I'm sure there's some governance for toxicity and so
22 forth. I think that would just be the natural
23 progression of performance gets you in the game, right?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 Then the commission has got the heavy lift to figure out
3 what else does that need. Right now we're saying that
4 what else already exists for silt fence, being tensile
5 strength and so on.

6 MR. WATSON: I'm not disagreeing with that.
7 What I'm going to reiterate is on the different
8 property, on the additional properties or properties
9 that need to be included for these different products,
10 that was not my understanding of why I was asked to be
11 on the commission.

12 MR. MASTRONARDI: I understand.

13 MR. WATSON: I agree that those things are
14 needed, but in terms of what input I was thinking I was
15 providing was based on how do we get new products in and
16 how do you compare two types of silt fences or how do
17 you compare two types of sediment barriers. That's what
18 I was under the impression. Because where you could see
19 it as, yeah, let's put these different specifications,
20 these other qualities on, let's just call it silt fence
21 right now, now how are we going to start comparing
22 those? Are those going to be what's meeting or not
23 meeting, or is it just to put it on just so we have it?

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 I'm not upset with DOT. The progression of this is
3 getting more and more to where I'm feeling that the
4 commission is falling on the committee to make some
5 decisions that I was not under the impression that the
6 committee was going to be providing information on.

7 MR. DYKES: Other comments?

8 MR. PAGE: Real quick. The people that
9 manufacture Type C products, fabric, I think it would be
10 a courtesy for them for some type of a grace period.
11 Because this fabric is very expensive to manufacture and
12 I'm quite sure that there are quite a few people that
13 have tremendous amount of inventory with this product.
14 And if this is implemented January 1, I can assure you
15 there will be a great number of rolls of Type C silt
16 fence that will be left for decoration because it will
17 no longer be used. I don't know the exact price, but my
18 product compared to a roll of Type A, it will be less
19 than half. So they are not going to buy my product.
20 Everyone that manufactures this product, whether DOT ops
21 to stick with the original program or ever how it goes,
22 the manufacturers of these materials need an opportunity
23 to get rid of their old inventory, because it is very,

231

1 TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

2 very costly. When I order a load of netting, it's like
3 almost \$100,000, and when you order a load of fabric,
4 and it will be a big thing for the guys that manufacture
5 this stuff to give them a justified grace period to
6 eliminate their old inventory. I think that's it,
7 Brent.

8 MR. DYKES: Thank you. Other comments from
9 the committee? Okay. We will call the committee back
10 as need arises in the months or days ahead, weeks ahead,
11 but at this time we stand adjourned.

12 (Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

C E R T I F I C A T E

4

5

6

7 G E O R G I A:

8 FULTON COUNTY:

9

10

I hereby certify that the foregoing

11

proceedings were reported, as stated in the

12

caption, and reduced to the written page

13

under my direction; that the foregoing pages

14

1 through 231 represent a true and correct

15

transcript of the proceedings.

16

This, the 11th day of November, 2014.

17

18

19

BARBARA HILGER, RPR

20

Certified Court Reporter #A-295

21

22

23

A	accepting (3) 53:15 144:14,15	192:6 218:15 229:8	36:21 42:5 56:13 67:21 72:11 76:16	allowed (18) 57:15 57:16 67:15
a1 (1) 21:18	accompanied (1) 46:4	additions (1) 3:14	78:5 83:9 86:13	119:18 121:2
a2 (1) 21:18	accomplish (1) 156:8	address (8) 19:23 20:5,21 38:5 43:4	87:22 91:22 98:8	166:7 171:7
a295 (2) 1:17 232:20	account (3) 49:3 169:20 173:19	120:19 198:22 225:19	112:14 117:2	175:20 180:12,15
aashto (4) 199:17 200:18 221:13	acquisitions (1) 157:6	addressed (1) 202:15	145:4 154:8 156:9	181:12,12 185:6
226:15	acre (1) 174:10	addresses (1) 43:3	157:20 176:5	186:8,15 191:18
abandoned (1) 11:16	act (1) 23:9	addressing (1) 39:5	227:5 228:12	192:20 197:5
abbreviation (2) 12:15 105:9	action (1) 4:15	adena (4) 2:10 67:22 98:22 151:6	229:13	allowing (8) 3:4 25:5 56:10 58:11
abbreviations (1) 11:22	activities (1) 11:15	adequate (1) 151:20	agreeable (1) 34:4	78:20 169:11
ability (5) 35:13 184:17 200:15	actual (5) 18:13 27:2 108:7 127:10	adjourned (2) 231:11,12	agreed (21) 11:18 17:8 19:17 21:21	175:13 196:21
217:11 228:10	add (20) 25:3,21 31:5 42:17,21	adjustment (2) 201:4,5	22:22 23:22 25:23	allows (6) 24:19 25:3 114:14
able (23) 14:22 29:22 58:20 78:15	46:9,14 49:13	adjustments (1) 56:16	47:15,19 55:15	119:12 120:9
80:20 100:23	71:18,22 98:7	adopting (1) 78:19	116:21 125:6,23	199:18
102:14,17,19	128:12,13 177:9	advance (3) 153:22 155:2,3	127:3 143:8 153:8	alter (1) 212:18
103:2 106:9	183:23 193:6	adviser (1) 87:17	171:15 172:12	alterations (1) 97:16
107:20 109:12	213:21 225:16	advisers (3) 2:13 3:7 19:6	174:6,21 177:16	altering (1) 209:20
112:20 128:21	226:11,17	advisory (6) 1:3 2:8 3:21 5:15 7:7	agreeing (2) 16:7 58:22	alternative (12) 136:7,12 159:13
173:2 180:22	added (25) 11:14 12:8 17:9,11	107:12	agreement (20) 10:22,22,23 11:7	159:18,21 190:16
181:21 185:17	23:20 28:3 46:10	affect (7) 15:14 63:17 82:13 119:7	16:18 17:4 18:23	190:18,19 191:5
192:6 204:5 214:6	47:21 57:7 61:16	121:22 122:4,5	19:2 20:20,22	193:9,14,15
217:19	81:14 102:3,3	agency (2) 54:13 63:11	25:20 32:8 52:8	alternatives (1) 138:23
absent (1) 149:11	128:5 133:2	agenda (9) 3:11,12 3:14,17,18 5:4,5	58:5 65:23 86:6,8	alters (1) 62:9
absolutely (3) 51:9 66:7 104:15	168:21 171:17	6:23 7:2	94:15 111:17	amended (2) 59:7 59:10
absorbs (1) 52:13	172:13 173:6	agent (1) 46:3	158:2	amendment (1) 81:14
abstain (1) 98:3	174:23 177:3,23	ago (6) 108:11 157:4 195:12,15	agrees (2) 13:9 52:3	american (2) 26:19 74:5
accept (5) 56:15 65:13 82:18	178:3 218:10	211:6 227:5	agriculture (2) 21:12,23	amount (11) 24:16 35:11 49:4 80:19
128:20 200:4	223:3	agree (29) 13:7 14:6 16:14 18:17	ahead (7) 24:10 82:18 91:8 132:15	106:16,23 107:2,9
acceptable (15) 66:2 75:4 87:19	adding (6) 9:17 29:2 45:7 104:9	19:13 33:6,11	151:22 231:10,10	165:18 223:21
107:23 118:21	170:22 226:19		aint (1) 56:21	230:13
125:4,7,12,15,16	addition (1) 226:15		alabama (1) 158:16	amounts (2) 48:17 220:13
125:18 130:14	additional (13) 24:18 52:6 56:11		align (1) 25:18	analysis (6) 132:22 144:22 145:2,7
199:8,8 202:23	56:15 85:3 92:4		allen (1) 212:9	164:14 178:8
accepted (6) 32:4 44:6 56:23 77:7	123:9 163:13		allow (17) 5:3 8:16 8:19 28:12 38:13	answer (12) 24:21
134:16 136:5	176:6 190:13		56:19 57:6 60:16	
			76:21 78:22,23	
			102:19 120:2	
			134:7 156:22	
			169:13 175:11	

80:22 115:11 117:17 123:12 129:12,15 141:19 180:19 187:8,22 202:3 answered (1) 186:6 anticipate (1) 4:21 anticipating (1) 224:16 anybody (32) 3:16 5:11 9:8 12:21 17:7 22:3 23:4,12 23:16 47:13 49:20 56:21 61:6,15 73:20 94:22 95:17 96:11 98:3,6,8 103:18 115:4 116:10 122:14,19 122:23 156:7 173:13 179:6 195:7 224:5 anybodys (2) 49:19 205:13 anymore (1) 210:19 anyplace (1) 32:22 anyway (2) 134:12 165:22 aoss (2) 194:17 198:7 apologize (2) 214:12 215:9 apparent (1) 219:18 appears (2) 96:21 183:14 appendices (2) 21:3 21:5 appendix (22) 21:9 21:10,16,17,18,19 21:21,21 22:10,10 22:22,23 23:2,5,6 23:7,13,15,18,21 24:9 26:2 apples (5) 120:15	204:22,22 205:7,7 application (28) 26:22 44:23 45:2 68:11 81:10 151:20 154:17,19 169:7,9 171:5,23 172:5 179:22 181:7 182:4 197:9 200:20,23 201:6 201:15,18 203:3 206:15 207:8 209:21 215:2 219:3 applications (18) 125:12 130:15 160:6 169:3,10 174:14 176:15 179:16,20 196:16 196:17,19 201:3 201:22 209:5,12 211:3 220:4 applied (8) 27:19 28:14 43:6 45:11 114:14 117:20 219:21 227:9 applies (2) 182:8,9 apply (5) 27:18 76:7,14 159:13 209:22 applying (1) 77:21 appreciate (4) 3:4,5 53:8 213:17 approach (2) 59:14 141:10 approval (3) 75:4 81:17 157:9 approve (7) 16:14 78:3 119:3 132:15 138:15 151:22 161:11 approved (67) 9:6 13:5 22:10 23:6 23:13 38:20,22 46:5 79:21,21 83:7 104:8 106:14	108:17,21 109:3 124:6 130:17,22 136:23 137:9,10 137:12,13,14 138:8,11,14 139:15,18,18,22 141:16,17,23 142:13 148:4 155:7,9 158:20 159:7,16 161:5,10 164:19 170:21 173:22 177:3 179:15,17,19 181:5 187:14,16 188:15,18,22 193:9,14,17,18,20 207:15,20 214:9 214:19 226:7 approving (1) 19:10 arbitrary (2) 29:19 128:7 area (18) 15:20 19:22 29:18 49:6 55:3,4 154:13 156:22 175:7,14 175:16 180:15 181:4 186:7 188:20,21 189:4 197:6 areas (14) 27:10,10 79:12 130:17 151:22 152:3 156:21 166:8 169:18 186:9,18 186:19 188:23 217:17 arent (3) 64:15 66:11 218:8 argue (2) 29:21 68:19 arguing (4) 31:11 43:20 127:9 129:14 argument (2)	153:11 167:11 arguments (1) 149:19 arises (1) 231:10 articulate (2) 46:7 189:13 articulated (1) 43:11 aside (1) 110:18 asked (7) 107:23 122:3 124:2 212:10 226:23 227:4 229:10 asking (7) 27:20 64:5 81:5 85:19 180:23 186:9 214:7 asks (2) 141:16 180:10 aspen (1) 38:17 assembled (2) 212:11,15 assignment (1) 227:14 assistance (1) 19:19 assume (6) 74:11 74:16 147:3,7 180:14 213:2 assuming (4) 14:9 146:19 225:9,11 assumption (1) 36:8 assumptions (1) 10:4 assurance (2) 91:21 216:12 assure (1) 230:14 astm (45) 28:6,7 31:14 32:9 33:7 36:11,16 43:16 48:16 54:17 55:6 73:21 75:3 83:21 102:7,12 108:8,21 109:2,3,4 111:13 111:14 113:22	114:3,11,22 115:3 115:5,7,7,11,12 115:21 116:2,7,11 116:23 169:2,5 208:10,14,17,18 216:7 astms (1) 110:13 atcps (1) 44:23 athens (1) 4:9 atlanta (1) 20:9 attach (2) 189:22 192:18 attached (1) 170:15 attainable (1) 156:10 attempt (1) 161:16 attention (3) 3:11 6:17 19:15 attractive (1) 103:14 auburn (1) 119:10 audience (4) 4:10 5:8 7:3 28:2 audit (2) 207:2,4 audited (1) 206:23 authorities (1) 35:18 authority (3) 23:10 138:21 200:15 automatically (6) 106:14 142:18,21 164:19 193:19 206:5 available (4) 7:3 25:22 183:6 213:20 average (1) 100:4 aware (3) 5:16 92:5 190:7 axes (1) 24:23 axle (1) 36:18 B b (35) 8:3,4,6 81:18 104:22 105:5
---	---	--	--	---

120:4 132:3 133:16,17 154:10 164:20 166:14 168:9 179:12 185:12 187:5 191:2,8 193:18 201:2 205:22 206:3,5,8,11,15 214:4,6,10,14,18 214:23 215:15 218:3 b1 (2) 21:21 22:10 b2 (3) 22:10,22,23 back (81) 7:2 12:16 13:20,22 16:21 17:3 19:15 21:3 22:14,19 24:6 26:3 31:17 34:14 35:5 43:15 44:8 47:13 49:21 52:10 62:12,20 63:23 66:5 68:17 71:14 74:18,22 76:9 79:10 92:10 93:22 95:14 96:13 98:17 99:3 100:21 112:21 113:2 122:16 126:3 127:8 128:21 129:14 134:13 135:10 140:12,15 147:11 148:13 151:4 155:11 160:22 162:3,20 167:17 168:15 170:10,11,16 171:16,21 177:10 180:17 184:21 188:7,12 190:21 195:23 196:12 208:5,7 212:9,12 214:3 216:5 217:4 217:15 218:11 225:6 231:9 backing (21) 180:7	189:21,22 190:3,9 190:15,16,18,19 191:5,13,19 192:4 192:19 193:6,8,10 193:15,15,16 214:19 backofthenapkin... 156:18 backs (1) 5:12 bad (4) 36:12 61:7 161:4 195:4 balance (1) 156:19 bale (9) 48:7 60:9 61:14 69:10 72:22 73:5,6 81:9 110:6 bales (20) 7:20,21 8:18 9:14 48:2 61:2,2 70:9 71:21 72:19 81:18 82:4 100:22 130:4,5,11 130:13 145:3,5 200:20 barbara (2) 1:16 232:19 barrier (10) 8:10 52:5 81:21 114:15 131:20 134:3 208:8 224:22 226:20 228:16 barriers (14) 8:8 12:11 27:19 104:9 131:22 168:9,11 168:12 177:22 179:11 220:2 224:15 225:17 229:17 base (2) 166:6 211:2 based (43) 10:3,6 13:3,4 15:6 23:19 27:4 30:5 32:14 36:6,22 42:14 50:10,22 54:13 55:3 56:3 92:15 112:7 125:21	129:20 130:7 151:14,16 152:7,9 152:14,17 159:2 166:5 168:4 180:5 204:23 208:18 209:4 211:12 213:16 221:4,14 221:17 223:18 226:12 229:15 baseline (1) 67:20 basic (1) 29:3 basically (36) 7:17 7:19,22 10:12 11:22 12:14 13:22 27:4,8 55:6 61:13 67:5 69:19 75:20 100:23 101:22 113:6 140:20 141:21 162:10 169:2,5,6,16 170:23 171:20 172:2,14 173:7,8 173:10,20 174:7 175:2 176:9 211:16 basing (2) 124:12 208:20 basis (6) 66:4 137:2 137:15 138:16,21 158:4 basket (1) 221:6 beall (1) 90:7 bear (1) 149:6 bed (1) 121:14 beefedup (1) 73:4 beg (1) 212:6 began (1) 4:12 beginning (4) 16:22 99:10,13 223:15 begun (1) 161:17 behave (1) 149:14 behold (1) 181:22 behrend (16) 2:14 13:11,16 20:3 38:4,15 39:4 74:2	74:5 131:10,13,15 131:18 143:21 144:17 150:17 belabor (1) 89:6 believe (22) 22:13 22:20 48:20 49:6 53:17 55:10 75:10 80:3 94:12 101:6 102:8 114:8 120:11 174:16 175:4 183:3 187:4 187:12 191:2 199:14 214:4 227:19 bell (1) 122:14 beltech (1) 187:5 belton (2) 218:9,19 ben (26) 2:5 7:16 11:20 15:18 18:2 22:17,18 26:23 27:12 28:4,23 35:2 43:8 48:12 67:8 74:15 79:23 101:20 110:18 168:21 184:20 192:10 202:5 214:9,11 223:20 bench (1) 110:20 benchmark (10) 119:16,21,23 140:11,14,19 142:19 143:20 155:18 209:4 benefit (2) 85:18 218:15 bens (1) 53:9 bentonite (29) 104:18 117:20 119:7,13,17,20,22 120:11,18,23 121:6,8,10,17,22 122:11 124:4 131:5 165:16 209:2,6,9,11,22 210:2,4,5,18,22	berm (4) 174:22 175:11,12,20 berms (2) 12:8 175:9 best (9) 4:13 26:8 76:6 107:5 117:3 142:5 144:9 165:5 165:10 better (17) 7:21 10:2 24:19 25:3,5 25:23 29:22 35:18 37:11 109:23 110:20 123:12 156:23 158:7 200:21 222:13 227:6 betty (4) 2:9 117:2 132:14 133:9 beyond (3) 62:19 150:18 227:13 bid (1) 153:22 big (8) 84:8,16 95:21 124:19 197:15 216:19 222:5 231:4 bigger (3) 38:12 80:5 184:5 biggest (3) 156:6 172:19 188:9 binder (2) 171:23 172:8 binders (2) 47:16 47:18 biodegradable (2) 41:11 228:7 bit (15) 4:10 11:21 24:20 37:6 40:2 55:7,12 59:10 107:15 111:11 143:21 167:6 168:21 212:6 227:13 blanket (18) 12:2,7 26:12 28:13 29:9 30:19,22 32:4
--	--	--	--	---

40:10,11,13,17,17 40:23 41:7,8,9 114:13 blankets (5) 30:11 30:17 39:19 41:12 41:13 blew (1) 203:20 block (2) 172:2,3 blocking (1) 209:20 blocks (1) 209:17 blow (1) 75:7 blowing (1) 204:2 blown (2) 12:17 51:2 blowout (20) 48:21 48:22,23 50:23 63:7,9,9 66:4 100:2,8 101:14 201:4 202:10,13 203:8 204:5,8,14 204:20,21 blowouts (8) 93:9 93:11 101:8 202:6 205:17,18 209:14 209:16 blows (2) 49:2 203:19 bmp (25) 12:12 37:10 38:20 39:18 43:12 44:13 45:18 47:9 51:22 75:7 103:5 131:12 136:7,12 150:3 159:18,21 169:21 174:22 175:10 177:13,22 178:16 179:2 219:15 bmps (27) 11:20,23 12:7,14 14:16,22 26:9 38:22 46:8 46:15,16 47:3 69:8 71:8,11 77:18 100:19 104:22 110:4 141:7 159:21	169:11,18 170:17 171:17 217:18 227:3 board (4) 4:19 85:16 112:13 161:11 boat (1) 222:10 bob (11) 2:9 110:15 115:12,16 147:11 165:7 166:4 195:7 205:23 220:21 226:13 book (27) 30:13,14 44:16 64:14 67:22 68:7 81:13 88:9 88:10 132:5 147:18 161:14,19 182:4,20 183:3,19 183:20,21,22 184:3,15 192:17 199:9 226:15 227:8,12 booth (2) 187:10 211:6 bottom (5) 26:7 69:19 114:15 209:10,11 bought (1) 77:23 box (3) 33:2 34:11 62:9 boxes (2) 127:19 128:22 break (3) 92:22 99:5 168:14 breakdown (1) 12:12 breaking (1) 104:18 breaks (5) 102:9 193:12 208:6,7,8 brent (7) 2:3 3:8 87:18 122:4 124:2 151:21 231:7 brents (1) 192:3 brian (2) 2:10	228:9 brief (4) 4:5,15 5:6 12:18 briefly (1) 150:23 bring (8) 16:9 78:22 95:16 151:13 178:20 193:18 216:5 228:10 bringing (2) 151:14 162:21 brings (1) 69:10 britt (1) 2:9 broad (4) 111:17 136:21,22 149:12 broader (3) 51:4 135:2,4 broadly (1) 189:6 brochures (2) 90:4 90:5 broke (1) 103:8 brought (21) 43:21 46:16 49:9 56:7 88:13 89:5 110:18 131:8,8 132:23 134:8 172:5 198:15,18,19 202:8,9 211:6,14 213:8 214:13 brown (28) 2:9 12:23 13:8 15:4 18:2,7,19 25:8 28:23 41:14 48:5 52:21 53:17 60:18 60:21 71:14 72:12 73:15 83:9 103:22 116:21 132:14 133:21 148:3 151:21 157:3 158:2 165:19 brush (1) 177:22 budget (2) 93:3 165:20 buffer (2) 176:12 176:23	build (1) 107:20 builds (1) 80:20 built (2) 41:3 183:12 builtin (1) 218:12 bunch (7) 28:8,9 54:9 64:19 96:7 134:6 177:7 buoyancy (1) 173:15 buried (1) 73:6 bury (1) 73:17 business (5) 108:12 141:6 160:16 182:15 195:3 buy (7) 71:7 172:20 180:15 187:20 218:5 225:8 230:19 buying (1) 184:11	c5 (3) 24:11 25:8,9 calculate (2) 10:11 127:7 calculation (3) 10:9 83:15 180:5 calculations (2) 134:13 173:18 calendar (3) 6:2,3 156:23 california (1) 162:8 call (17) 3:2,10 52:22 57:15 61:3 70:15 83:3,4 96:23 99:2 125:13 142:13 147:2 191:17 200:7 229:20 231:9 called (9) 59:7 66:3 96:18 97:15,18 98:5 108:12 212:9 227:8 calling (1) 83:2 callout (1) 96:19 calls (2) 24:12 215:6 cant (16) 39:14 54:22 57:22,23 58:20 62:8 75:17 75:19 79:21 138:15 141:3 147:4 179:11 182:9 187:7 216:7 capability (1) 69:13 caption (1) 232:12 care (2) 21:6 99:14 carpet (2) 110:5 138:3 carry (1) 82:3 carve (1) 220:19 case (10) 17:22 40:12,18 68:2 78:19 84:21 96:4 192:5 200:16,16 casebybase (1) 137:15
--	--	---	---	---

cases (1) 169:21 catch (2) 147:9 220:14 categories (13) 26:21 27:13,15 29:10,11,13 31:7 101:23 135:8 164:17 166:10 172:9 186:3 categorization (5) 36:6,15 104:21 151:14 166:16 category (16) 31:6 39:14 105:5,7 133:21 134:18 146:15 151:16 152:11,17 164:16 185:23 189:18 219:4,11 227:22 catered (1) 198:3 catering (2) 64:16 198:5 cause (2) 80:10 147:15 causing (1) 119:17 caution (2) 33:17 90:11 cautious (1) 62:11 cement (1) 77:14 center (5) 1:9 3:5 183:7,7 191:3 centered (1) 6:11 centers (16) 180:13 180:18,20,21 181:3,7,18,19 182:19,19 183:2 185:8,9 187:15 191:14 214:18 central (1) 163:21 cert (4) 206:17,19 207:3,5 certain (12) 35:11 55:4,4 106:23 185:10 194:17,18 196:6 210:14	219:11 224:16 228:17 certainly (10) 4:22 10:19 17:3 24:3 26:5,10 28:2 81:6 85:15 137:4 certainty (1) 6:9 certification (2) 165:23 217:6 certified (5) 1:17 112:20 141:14 208:2 232:20 certify (3) 207:21 208:3 232:10 certifying (1) 207:12 cetera (4) 30:17,17 106:4 107:3 cfr (1) 172:23 cfs (7) 48:18 54:19 54:21 62:22 74:14 100:15,22 challenge (3) 197:13 216:21,22 challenging (1) 216:23 chance (7) 6:5 15:12 51:22,23 58:19 120:5 162:4 change (51) 12:15 12:16 13:2,12,14 13:15 14:13,15,17 15:13 16:3,3 17:3 17:5,8 18:20 19:3 20:3,4,6 23:4,4,7 23:11,13,15,17 25:23 31:3 33:4 34:2,5 52:12,13 55:8 58:13 63:21 91:4,5 104:2,6,8 105:8 132:19 155:20 164:14 194:5,10,18,19 208:17 changed (27) 7:10	11:23 12:2 14:15 15:8 20:2,21 23:2 26:4 47:13,17 49:7,7 64:6 69:17 76:3 82:18 112:19 112:21,22 113:5 116:6 148:16 155:4 186:8 194:7 207:8 changes (30) 3:14 7:4,9 11:12 13:18 16:5,10 18:22 19:16 20:19 21:2 22:21 23:21 24:3 24:5 28:10 32:10 34:5 41:23 47:5 47:18 74:21 91:7 104:7 157:7 169:23 170:20 171:16 172:12 177:17 changing (8) 15:15 25:4,4 33:3,12 38:12 143:9 157:5 channel (13) 50:3,4 50:5 53:14 99:6 101:17,19 102:7 103:3,7,20 104:8 208:8 channels (1) 201:3 chapter (68) 10:18 10:21,21 11:11,17 11:18,19 12:12,14 12:15,19 13:3,4,6 13:10,11,15,17 14:17 15:3,5,17 15:20 16:4,5,18 16:18,20 17:4,8 17:14,16 18:21,22 19:3,4,6,10,13,16 19:16,17,17,18 20:10,15,19,20,23 20:23 21:4,5,10 23:23 24:6,7 26:3 46:12 47:2 72:10	99:3,5,6,10 101:18 104:11 168:20 171:14 chapters (1) 16:6 charge (1) 163:22 chart (7) 24:14,16 24:22,23 25:4 127:20 222:6 charts (1) 10:4 chattahoochee (2) 185:5 189:11 cheap (1) 195:5 cheapened (1) 196:9 cheaper (4) 55:12 190:4,4 191:14 cheapest (2) 73:14 73:19 check (11) 52:5,21 65:14 67:10 68:2 86:15 88:16 91:12 100:21 113:19 217:15 checkdam (22) 51:13 57:11 58:6 59:15 60:5,7 68:11 69:11 71:5 71:17 72:22 74:6 79:19 81:22 82:2 97:19 99:13,19,20 183:15 200:20 203:21 checkdams (24) 47:20,21 48:3,8 50:20 51:12 58:12 60:8,9,18 61:13 61:13 64:23 66:10 66:18 71:8 72:19 78:20,22 98:9 99:5 131:5 198:15 198:19 checked (1) 113:17 checks (2) 71:21 173:20 choice (3) 17:21	72:22 150:6 choose (7) 111:9 120:10 126:12 150:6 159:18 177:14 184:16 chooses (4) 17:20 54:17 177:13 204:21 chose (2) 55:15 185:20 chosen (2) 73:11 159:12 circle (1) 43:15 circumstances (1) 161:23 cities (1) 23:9 city (1) 57:21 civic (2) 1:9 3:5 clarification (9) 56:22 72:15 99:8 107:8 111:11 179:10 182:14 183:17 199:5 clarified (1) 162:9 clarify (7) 9:12,16 72:12 114:5 115:6 120:23 215:17 clarity (4) 27:23 56:6 81:6 115:18 classification (1) 219:9 clause (4) 59:13 79:11 83:2 147:20 clay (15) 48:17 55:7,11 74:13,20 74:22 75:4 76:8 84:3 93:18,20,21 114:10 116:5 118:12 clear (12) 59:13,18 91:18 98:11 99:10 116:3,9,12 129:2 162:13 164:12 191:9 client (1) 182:20
---	---	---	---	--

close (6) 53:6 70:5 144:14,15 212:20 217:16 closely (5) 110:17 114:10,20,23 163:10 closer (4) 81:4 110:21 183:15,16 clue (1) 195:7 coagulant (2) 171:22 172:8 coagulants (3) 12:9 47:10 171:18 coastal (1) 20:13 code (5) 5:23 11:13 47:17 200:2 201:13 coded (1) 24:2 coliform (1) 137:21 collected (1) 66:5 color (2) 90:4,5 combined (1) 21:18 come (73) 12:4 16:21 17:3 28:15 31:10 45:15 49:21 54:11 58:6 59:2 61:4,5,12,22 71:8 76:11,14 77:3,10 85:21 93:3 94:14 94:17,22 96:11,14 96:15 97:14,21 107:13 110:13 114:17 120:2,3,16 124:23 126:5 128:9,16 129:18 133:7 135:11,21 137:21 138:5 139:21 145:12,18 151:2 154:3,17,19 155:22 159:20 161:13,18 168:15 173:3 174:12,16 185:20 191:16 204:17 212:22 213:16 216:17	217:18,19 221:10 224:18 225:6 226:8 227:2 comes (13) 42:12 59:8 65:22 76:9 112:10 120:13 127:18 128:10 129:6 180:21 182:17 183:17 226:7 comfort (3) 16:23 63:12,13 comfortable (10) 51:10 58:10 64:19 64:22 82:22 118:3 118:6 127:16 151:18 167:10 coming (7) 54:8 76:10 92:10 96:23 142:3 147:12 153:17 comment (44) 4:23 4:23 5:5,13 16:20 17:2,15,23 18:8 18:10 21:20 22:4 22:14,17 23:6 24:9 25:2 26:11 27:2,19 28:16 32:11 34:15 39:4 40:5 45:10 46:11 46:16 50:8,21 53:9 60:3 74:2,4 120:8 132:9 177:6 178:16 179:7 194:4,14 213:23 215:22 218:7 commentors (2) 38:5,7 comments (61) 4:8 7:7 17:14 19:5 21:15 22:21,22 25:6 26:18,19 27:3,17 28:17,20 31:23 38:15 45:4 46:20 47:23 48:7	49:14 51:10 59:21 59:22 60:12 99:3 101:18 103:5,6,20 107:14 119:4 122:16 123:3 124:3 168:11 169:22 170:2,7,8 170:15 171:10,13 171:15 172:11,19 174:5,21 177:7,21 178:14,15 179:2 194:9 215:20 218:17 226:22 227:10,15 230:7 231:8 commission (26) 2:3,5 3:9 4:4,19 5:8 78:2 84:13 85:16 86:16 91:17 93:3 125:2 137:11 137:12,14 140:18 141:10 142:12 201:8 202:4 207:13 215:13 229:2,11 230:4 commissions (1) 5:15 committed (2) 62:7 177:19 committee (90) 1:3 2:8 3:6,11,21,21 4:8,18 5:3,7,15,22 7:7,20 8:8 9:8 10:19,23 11:9,16 12:22 13:23 19:6 21:6 25:7,21 26:10 27:23 28:7 30:7 34:4,23 36:3 38:6 41:20 47:11 51:9 52:16 54:19 56:2,5 58:9,14 63:16,19 64:4 74:13,20 78:15 84:13 85:14 93:4 95:15 107:12,17	107:18 110:16 111:18,21 112:4,6 114:16 116:10 118:10 125:15 128:16 129:5,6 133:10 137:4 145:6 146:5 163:10 164:3 174:15 178:20 179:3 188:6 204:20 205:18 213:9 215:20 223:22 226:18 227:2,13 230:4,6 231:9,9 committees (14) 29:5 30:9 47:14 48:12 63:12 85:17 86:5 98:3 99:18 116:14 132:7 151:11 162:14 225:15 common (4) 39:12 171:5,8 174:11 communication (1) 138:19 community (2) 156:19 198:23 companies (5) 96:7 113:14 158:17 165:19 218:8 company (12) 26:19 69:9 106:2 141:17 158:16 159:11 162:12 198:3,10 200:9 204:22 225:20 companys (1) 74:6 comparable (1) 120:20 compare (4) 112:13 142:19 229:16,17 compared (4) 100:10,12 178:13 230:18	compares (1) 147:17 comparing (2) 120:15 229:21 compete (1) 163:8 competition (3) 140:6 160:19 162:11 competitive (1) 190:3 compile (1) 137:6 complete (2) 22:6 155:15 completed (2) 50:23 146:12 completely (4) 39:5 40:4 82:21 201:16 completes (1) 177:16 complicated (3) 105:15 116:15,16 compost (41) 49:10 49:17 50:13 51:3 62:22 68:10,22 69:3 70:13 71:14 79:19,20 81:9 82:10 86:18 91:4 94:14,20 95:2,6 96:9,11,17 97:23 98:14 131:14,22 137:20 138:2 161:9 179:12 184:18 185:3 189:9 190:4 191:12 195:20 209:11 217:18 219:19 220:6 composting (1) 162:4 comprised (1) 228:20 computer (1) 21:14 concentrate (1) 169:6 concentrated (1)
--	--	---	---	--

197:9 concentrations (1) 110:23 concern (14) 38:6,7 38:10,16,18 78:13 78:17 90:14 107:16 124:4 169:19 196:5,9 220:10 concerned (2) 170:6 186:10 concerns (13) 26:16 46:21 49:9 63:21 79:2 104:14 104:15 117:23 137:20 165:15 177:20 197:12,13 conclusion (2) 87:21 97:21 concrete (1) 103:9 concur (1) 82:21 concurrence (1) 59:4 condition (1) 103:19 conditions (2) 79:20 110:21 conform (1) 44:23 confused (4) 37:14 114:6 182:2 191:21 confusing (2) 181:10 201:20 confusion (5) 13:12 13:19 37:7 39:23 211:16 connected (1) 12:20 conscious (1) 157:22 conservation (6) 2:3,5 4:19 21:12 22:2,9 conserve (1) 177:7 consider (8) 54:3	58:15 78:18 142:9 143:2 150:19 153:16 208:23 considerable (1) 124:16 considerably (2) 105:23 191:14 consideration (10) 5:19 6:12 40:21 47:11 48:13 100:17 137:5 178:23 202:7,16 considerations (3) 37:13,18 39:8 considered (3) 101:20 142:22 168:12 considering (2) 32:10 142:10 consistency (1) 117:14 consistent (1) 212:20 constituents (1) 228:20 constructed (2) 32:15 33:8 construction (7) 6:9 41:3,4 111:4,4 124:17 205:22 consultants (1) 24:13 consuming (1) 73:10 contact (2) 19:17 19:21 content (1) 121:14 contents (1) 5:19 contingent (1) 207:3 continually (1) 78:4 continue (9) 39:17 61:6,8,9 99:3 140:16 168:18	185:13 203:13 continued (1) 66:4 continuously (2) 159:17 209:15 contract (7) 84:15 84:15 86:19 88:5 139:3 141:15 142:11 contracting (1) 154:2 contractor (2) 72:19 225:5 contractors (4) 183:6,6 200:9 201:19 contribute (1) 123:9 contributed (1) 165:14 control (28) 1:4 5:20 19:19 30:19 34:20 48:19 49:4 49:8,22 63:5 70:16,17 79:4 83:18 100:9,10,12 100:15 101:5,7,9 111:16,19 158:17 170:22 182:16 215:11 216:13 controversial (2) 67:11 86:9 controversy (6) 49:17 52:18 79:8 87:22 91:18 147:16 conventional (1) 149:8 conversation (2) 40:19 117:16 conversion (1) 23:15 convert (1) 152:2 coordinating (1) 17:10 corps (1) 20:13	correct (17) 20:18 20:22 26:17 27:16 30:4 75:14 85:12 143:7 152:23 164:22 181:13 193:22 199:13 209:5,18 214:11 232:14 correctly (14) 33:11 65:17 70:18 86:7 92:2,3,7,11 96:20 121:3 172:10 175:15 187:21 202:7 cost (12) 52:13 75:2 86:22 105:22 115:14 123:7,9 163:13 180:11,12 183:9 190:2 costly (1) 231:2 costs (3) 107:4 123:11 197:18 couldnt (3) 27:7 86:3 223:7 counterintuitive ... 149:8 counties (1) 23:9 country (2) 48:4 109:14 county (4) 1:9 3:4 57:21 232:8 couple (9) 6:4 44:8 61:12 84:20 110:13 122:7 180:9 204:3 226:12 course (2) 24:21 193:20 court (5) 1:17 3:23 6:13 90:13 232:20 courtesy (1) 230:10 cover (5) 72:10 102:14 136:19 157:10,12 covers (2) 46:13,15	cpop (5) 179:9 180:11 182:15 190:3 191:18 crazy (1) 76:17 create (6) 13:12,19 39:23 66:21 99:23 107:18 created (4) 10:10 55:17 143:6 152:13 creates (1) 33:6 creating (2) 107:16 153:6 credibility (2) 59:11 158:7 crew (1) 210:11 criteria (35) 28:3 30:8 31:4 33:21 38:11,14,21 39:16 44:7,22 47:21 48:13 56:3 57:22 61:16 64:17,21 78:2 79:7 82:20 90:22 91:6 101:20 103:17 104:10 161:12 167:16,18 168:21,23 180:3 205:6 206:22 207:7 227:3 critical (1) 213:7 crossection (1) 50:10 csf (2) 83:18 87:9 curb (1) 12:8 current (4) 56:19 108:3 129:4 207:4 currently (19) 3:13 6:6 27:12 34:11 50:19 105:17 117:5 124:6 132:8 134:20,22 158:17 168:10 181:5 191:15 193:8,15 198:21 206:23 curtain (2) 176:6,8
--	--	--	---	--

25:4 customer (5) 180:21 181:21 182:17 183:17 184:23 customers (2) 181:2 200:7 cut (3) 123:7 212:16 213:2 cuts (1) 35:12 cutting (2) 212:17 214:8 cycle (1) 44:2	207:14,17,21 208:4 210:3,15 211:21 212:5 day (7) 3:7 60:7 81:4 157:5 221:5 222:6 232:16 days (6) 5:5 56:5 59:4 153:21 155:16 231:10 deadline (3) 56:21 58:21 136:10 deal (2) 115:22 205:11 death (1) 93:6 debate (4) 10:10 90:11 96:20 128:6 december (1) 58:21 decide (12) 14:20 15:13 49:22 51:10 56:2 83:22 88:15 125:7 140:19 148:20 157:23 188:6 decided (9) 28:7 48:15 74:20 94:18 121:17 152:8 158:23 174:17 194:7 decides (2) 95:15 106:7 deciding (1) 119:9 decision (6) 36:22 141:22 142:5 146:16,19 199:7 decisions (1) 230:5 decoration (1) 230:16 deep (3) 15:12 34:8 73:11 defend (1) 118:6 defense (1) 150:3 defensible (2) 144:12 157:17 defer (2) 121:20 122:2	deficiencies (1) 52:9 define (6) 35:18,23 192:3,4 203:16 226:9 defined (3) 48:22 48:23 202:10 defines (1) 35:8 definitely (1) 63:6 definition (4) 37:10 63:7 175:23 202:9 definitions (1) 37:12 degrades (1) 36:8 deleted (1) 170:13 deliberate (1) 5:4 deliberation (1) 7:12 deliberations (1) 5:23 demonstrate (3) 204:9,10,12 density (3) 28:18 32:12 176:2 department (7) 21:12,23 66:12 88:13 196:6 216:2 228:15 departments (2) 49:14 58:3 depend (1) 70:3 depending (7) 54:12 69:18,20,23 150:12 171:23 184:12 depends (4) 73:15 109:9 126:16 201:3 derived (1) 90:23 described (2) 39:3 133:9 describing (1) 187:3 design (8) 6:8 18:6 106:9 141:9	150:13 201:5,6 224:5 designated (3) 104:17 130:14 193:5 designation (1) 104:11 designed (3) 150:2 157:4 225:12 designer (9) 35:13 35:17 36:20 37:13 37:13 39:22 150:6 150:8 169:13 designers (3) 36:14 138:6 176:19 designs (1) 15:2 desire (1) 131:2 detail (13) 18:3 24:20 48:13 66:6 71:16 72:16 73:3 73:5 82:5 89:7,10 174:16 190:8 details (4) 12:17 26:4 89:11 131:18 deteriorates (1) 225:6 determination (1) 52:16 determine (11) 21:15 29:17 78:7 145:7 146:7,15 148:15 149:11 207:2 209:3,4 determined (2) 31:2 169:11 determines (3) 125:10 200:3 203:12 detract (1) 36:16 developed (1) 62:2 development (7) 17:11 64:16,17 153:21 171:5,8 174:11 deviated (2) 74:14	75:11 deviates (1) 53:13 deviation (22) 128:13,17,18 129:20 130:7 133:5 143:6 144:5 144:7,8,12 146:6 146:12 148:15 152:8,10,14,18 153:7 154:20 159:3 166:7 devices (1) 226:17 dewater (2) 172:23 173:11 dewatering (1) 172:16 dewaters (1) 173:11 dewey (2) 2:15 37:20 diameter (1) 192:12 didn't (30) 16:9,9 16:21 23:4 29:9 47:5 48:20 54:14 57:21 64:9 70:13 70:16 92:2 101:8 111:8 116:7 121:8 130:5,6,8 161:11 161:15 167:13 177:5 188:13 203:20 207:10 210:19 213:13 214:11 diego (1) 163:16 differ (1) 212:6 difference (5) 49:3 137:17 138:8 209:13,14 different (94) 6:6 8:5,8,22 10:20 26:20 28:8,9 29:9 29:11 31:10 34:12 48:18 53:2,10 54:5,23 55:2
--	--	---	--	--

60:12 67:12,14 71:2,3,11 72:5 74:9 76:4,23 77:8 77:12,13,13,15,16 77:18 87:4 89:8 90:13 96:6 97:19 104:17,23 105:2,5 105:7 108:8 109:18 110:10,13 113:6,16,19 119:17 120:20 128:8 129:13 134:6 137:18,19 137:20,23 138:2,2 138:3,4,5 142:4 145:14 149:17 154:23 169:10,13 172:9 173:18 181:11 182:22 186:3 188:13 196:20,22 199:10 200:13 201:12 211:19,23 212:3,8 212:22 217:7 222:17 224:10 229:7,9,19 differentiate (1) 67:17 differently (6) 29:8 50:16 71:11 80:11 95:16 120:21 difficult (4) 10:8 55:18 64:13 73:6 diligent (1) 134:8 dime (2) 140:22 202:21 dimension (1) 192:3 direct (2) 26:23 200:6 direction (4) 10:20 112:5 226:23 232:13 directly (4) 126:10 126:17,21 207:6	director (2) 2:3 3:9 dirt (3) 175:5,6 202:19 disagree (4) 12:21 21:6 48:5 115:4 disagreeing (1) 229:6 disagreement (6) 11:2,17 13:9 16:19 25:6 31:13 disagreements (1) 156:17 disagrees (1) 10:19 disapproved (1) 108:18 discharge (2) 11:14 17:13 discharges (1) 175:13 discretion (1) 57:20 discuss (3) 11:2 44:10 223:21 discussed (11) 4:15 39:10 51:8 84:22 93:6 110:17 174:22 178:9,18 178:19 195:13 discussing (2) 75:20 190:15 discussion (46) 4:10,12,16 5:19 6:10,19,23 13:23 14:14 15:13,17 16:15 34:7 37:23 55:21 62:11 81:2 98:9 99:4 104:12 104:20 105:12 107:6 111:21 112:2,4 118:17 119:8 124:8 125:18 127:5 128:23 140:3,8 143:5 158:13 166:19 172:7 177:2,15,18 178:5	178:15,23 216:15 223:23 discussions (3) 11:5 11:6 111:8 dislike (1) 14:8 dissipation (1) 70:15 dissipator (2) 64:2 201:10 distinguish (1) 148:10 district (1) 19:21 ditch (12) 25:16 53:2,10,14,18,21 54:13,14,15 67:5 67:6,7 ditches (2) 53:12 54:5 dnr (1) 42:23 doctors (1) 119:10 document (1) 136:7 documentation (3) 92:6,7 138:10 documented (5) 45:23 46:2,2 89:16 90:8 documents (1) 45:22 doesnt (35) 8:14,22 12:16 23:11 33:3 35:14 39:21 41:4 41:12 43:8 63:8 71:16 76:8 83:5 94:15 98:6 112:11 112:11 115:9 123:17 126:11 148:9 155:16 157:10 175:22 176:13 192:3 202:23 208:14 209:13,18 219:20 220:4 222:19 228:9 dog (1) 222:5 doing (22) 6:8	53:16 72:9 84:7 90:12 100:11 116:10 119:16 123:18 129:20 130:12 143:13 146:6 156:14 160:7 177:9 190:7 198:4,10 208:12 216:11 220:20 dollars (4) 107:4 154:23 213:9,10 don (2) 194:14 226:13 donald (1) 2:18 dont (178) 6:18 8:5 8:17 9:22 12:19 12:23 14:17,19 15:2,4,20 16:2 19:7,9 21:5 28:5 29:6,7,10,13,15 29:20 32:2 34:9 35:21 36:11,15 37:3 39:19,22 43:5,20 45:14,14 47:3 49:22 50:11 50:15 51:6 52:5 52:12 59:7 61:7 61:21 62:7 65:18 65:21 66:3 68:20 70:8 72:16 73:17 74:17,19 75:15 76:16 78:10,16 80:6,11,21,23 81:11,14 82:23 84:2 86:19 88:2 90:11 91:2 94:23 95:20 96:22 97:16 99:9 103:4,12,18 106:7 109:11 110:3,4 111:23 113:10 114:17 115:16,17 116:9 116:17,19 117:22 118:20 119:13,19 120:5,6,16,18	121:8,23 123:8 125:22 129:11 131:4 133:9,13 134:3 135:3 136:9 136:17,19 137:5 137:15 138:4,21 140:16 141:15,18 142:6 143:8 144:5 144:19 145:17,22 149:14 150:15 153:16,16 155:3 156:17 157:12 163:23 164:9 167:4,17 170:5 172:2,11 175:14 176:17 177:14 180:18 181:18 183:5,6,8,10 186:23 189:14,15 190:23 191:12 193:14 194:20 195:21 203:4 204:3,4,14,15 205:13,14,14,17 205:18 208:3 209:23 210:16,23 214:2 218:6 220:9 221:15,23 225:2 227:19 228:6 230:17 door (1) 184:23 dot (76) 25:10 29:8 29:10 32:4 52:3 53:4,22 57:16,18 64:14 82:10 84:11 91:23 92:3 98:4 102:8,15,18 106:13 131:21 134:17,21 135:3,4 135:14,15 137:11 138:23 140:23 146:23 147:6 148:4 151:12 152:5,9,18 156:17 157:3 158:10
--	--	--	---	---

160:9 162:14 164:19 166:11 171:2 179:16 185:21 194:6,16 196:17 198:21 199:3,9,20,21 200:4,5,11,14,17 201:9,11,11,12,14 202:3 218:19 219:10 220:18 221:2 222:13,16 222:18 223:2 224:2 230:2,20 dots (2) 135:5 141:23 dotw (1) 52:22 double (4) 54:4 69:12,13 183:9 doubt (1) 71:3 dr (6) 50:11 52:5 68:5 85:4 121:13 175:6 drain (1) 228:17 drainage (1) 55:3 draw (3) 9:15 19:15 127:19 drawing (5) 18:6,7 34:11 125:11 128:22 drawings (2) 26:4 194:23 drawn (5) 103:3 154:9,15 155:2,10 drill (1) 173:13 drive (2) 75:2 190:2 drop (2) 54:10 61:13 drops (1) 62:8 dry (1) 55:11 due (4) 95:19 154:22 157:5 169:14 dumps (1) 181:22 durability (1)	150:20 duration (3) 35:15 35:16 184:11 dykes (195) 2:3 3:2 3:8 7:15 10:16 11:11 12:19 13:8 13:14,21 14:4,8 16:17 17:7 18:18 18:20 19:11,15 20:10,19 21:9,20 22:8,16,21 24:10 24:18 25:2,20 27:12,23 30:9 31:12 32:8 34:4 37:23 41:20,23 44:11 45:4 46:9 46:20 47:7 48:7 48:12 50:5 51:8 55:21 58:8 63:11 78:18 81:2 84:6 84:10,22 85:9,13 86:5,10 88:8,14 92:21 93:4 95:5,9 97:21 98:14,19 99:2,14 101:17 103:4,20 104:7,15 105:10 106:11,20 107:6,14 112:3 113:23 114:5,16 114:21 115:2,9,15 115:21 116:5,9,16 118:9,12,17 119:4 122:15 123:3 124:8 125:13 132:6 134:15 135:2 136:17,21 137:2,10,13 138:10,15,19 139:7,9,23 140:4 140:8 142:9,20 143:5,11 145:6 146:4,21 147:10 148:10 151:11 152:4,13,22 153:8 158:9,22 159:8,11	160:9,17 162:13 162:20 164:3,11 164:22 165:7 166:19 167:20,22 168:9,14,17 169:22 170:20 171:10,14,20 172:11 173:5 174:5,20 175:14 175:18 176:5 177:2,15 178:5,12 179:6 181:6 190:8 190:14,19 192:21 193:3 194:12,14 198:13 201:8 202:2 207:13,15 207:19 208:2 213:18,22 214:21 215:5,8,14,16,19 216:14 218:17 225:14 226:18 227:15 230:7 231:8 E e (6) 2:2,2 23:15 232:3,3,7 earlier (9) 34:15 58:7 103:2 111:10 122:3 132:3 148:4 150:20 188:12 early (1) 96:16 easements (1) 157:6 easier (1) 10:13 easiest (1) 109:16 easily (3) 69:5 106:5 128:6 easy (6) 33:14 72:22,23 73:19 84:17 173:13 ecps (1) 42:10 ectc (2) 35:3 40:6 edge (1) 185:4 edit (2) 16:20 18:23	edited (1) 11:18 edition (45) 7:5,6 7:11,11 11:3 13:13,14,16,18,18 13:20,22 14:3,7 14:10,11 23:16,16 60:4,19 68:12,23 71:18 78:19 79:6 81:8 82:4,8,9 89:8 95:6 96:23 97:7 97:23 139:14 145:19 161:6,7 170:11,15,16 171:17 177:17 178:2,4 education (1) 37:22 effect (5) 4:17 6:2 6:10 160:15 162:2 effective (2) 53:19 186:7 effectiveness (2) 27:11 175:10 effects (2) 169:17 169:20 efficiency (5) 10:7 10:15 64:3 108:19 109:7 eigenberg (1) 2:15 eight (2) 155:2 172:15 either (35) 8:14 9:21 14:8 39:2 41:19 53:6 66:22 79:17 80:23 88:2 107:17 108:17 114:21 115:10,10 115:23 116:4,7,22 126:8,17,18 127:17 128:17 151:4 157:7,10 158:3 167:7 187:6 193:13 202:14 204:15 214:4 220:7 elements (1) 138:20	elephant (4) 86:11 86:22 87:14,16 elephants (1) 95:21 elevation (1) 228:17 eliminate (13) 30:11,15 40:10,15 40:19 60:21 62:3 66:21 105:20 125:19 148:9 165:15 231:6 eliminated (2) 30:18 202:15 eliminates (1) 72:7 eliminating (1) 50:13 elimination (2) 11:14 17:13 email (2) 138:17 221:4 emailing (1) 92:9 encompasses (1) 201:21 endall (1) 90:7 endorsement (1) 38:16 energy (1) 201:10 enforceable (1) 37:15 engineer (4) 102:16 106:9 126:15 182:13 engineers (3) 20:13 138:7 174:2 enjoyment (1) 88:20 ensure (1) 88:23 entire (2) 22:6 156:3 entities (2) 134:23 208:3 entity (1) 137:6 envelope (4) 82:12 82:17 91:5 198:7 environment (1)
--	--	--	--	---

189:20 environmental (1) 4:7 epa (3) 31:2 172:22 228:19 epd (11) 19:23 20:4 20:8,21 81:5 137:11 149:22 155:18 156:16 202:3 216:23 equal (2) 77:17 141:8 equally (1) 80:16 equation (9) 22:12 22:15,20 126:22 127:2,4,8,14 170:8 equations (1) 126:4 equipment (1) 102:4 equivalency (1) 102:13 equivalent (1) 134:3 eric (3) 2:14 22:4,8 erosion (12) 1:4 5:20 8:19 19:19 22:11 23:8 30:19 111:15,19 158:17 182:16 215:11 error (4) 83:15 202:17,19 212:16 errors (1) 213:7 escue (1) 2:11 especially (1) 191:13 essence (1) 218:11 essentially (2) 65:19 129:8 established (4) 50:9 88:8 115:21 192:2 establishing (1) 140:18 estimating (1) 22:11	et (4) 30:17,17 106:4 107:3 evaluation (2) 133:3 135:23 eventually (2) 157:21 217:3 everybody (19) 11:8 73:2 98:18 120:4 126:2,13 140:11,14 160:21 161:2 167:19 184:14 188:7 194:7 197:13 204:16 209:8,10 211:2 everybodys (1) 29:18 exact (7) 8:6 102:22 110:12 111:15 175:16 214:20 230:17 exactly (9) 15:18 35:6 88:14 112:12 136:9 169:17 182:10 212:2,4 example (9) 9:4 17:18,20,22 38:18 187:13 221:10,18 228:13 excelsior (6) 26:19 30:11,19 38:17 40:16 74:5 exception (1) 179:18 exclude (2) 39:2 130:10 excluded (1) 32:19 excuse (1) 204:18 execution (3) 118:16,17 125:4 executive (2) 2:3 3:8 exercise (1) 153:6 exist (2) 51:7 224:19	existing (27) 17:9 28:6 31:6 32:9 48:16 55:5 56:23 60:8 75:3 77:5 78:13 84:14 94:12 102:7,18 103:2 104:4 154:16 156:15 158:10 169:5 170:7,10 175:3 176:9 178:3 189:18 exists (2) 78:16 229:4 expand (5) 38:8 39:2,18 101:21 165:7 expect (5) 35:10 85:11 203:2 228:3 228:4 expecting (2) 36:9 205:9 expense (3) 134:6 165:3 167:8 expensive (8) 35:19 35:20 66:17 73:9 107:22 109:19,22 230:11 experience (1) 121:23 experienced (1) 85:20 explain (2) 11:20 24:23 explanation (1) 24:16 explore (1) 129:6 express (4) 10:22 11:2,17 22:3 expressed (1) 178:15 extend (2) 85:6 107:12 extended (2) 41:10 41:17 extensive (1) 37:4	extremely (1) 111:2 eyeball (1) 129:17 F f (3) 23:18,21 232:3 fabric (24) 99:19 110:7 186:23 189:7 197:23 198:20,22 199:2 199:11,14,19 200:8 206:14 213:6 214:14 217:2,12 218:19 220:12 223:8 226:3 230:9,11 231:3 fabrics (3) 191:3 198:8 211:7 facetious (1) 133:22 facilities (2) 142:7 163:7 facility (1) 210:9 fact (7) 37:5 92:15 115:4 120:20 154:22 203:12 217:5 factor (64) 7:13,17 9:6,22 10:6,17 15:7 27:9,18,21 29:3 31:15,16 32:9 62:9 63:16 63:18 97:11 99:23 100:3,6,7 104:16 105:16 111:20 119:5,7,8 120:16 125:17,20 126:3,9 126:15,23 127:3,5 127:7,13 132:6,12 135:11 146:7,8 150:18 151:17 152:10,13 159:2 159:12 164:14 165:4,10 168:4 178:8 181:14	192:2 214:10 222:11 223:3,7,10 227:23 228:18 factormr (1) 148:16 factors (11) 10:3 23:15 26:16 50:12 62:2 82:15,17 111:16 135:22 150:18 222:12 facts (1) 115:22 fail (10) 15:9 53:7 66:7 79:23 100:2 198:21 204:12 205:6,14 207:2 failed (9) 50:16,22 52:2 59:17 85:19 86:14 135:19 211:10,15 failing (4) 51:21 78:4 86:16 188:14 fails (2) 181:21 203:19 failure (7) 149:9 202:14,14,22 203:9 204:20,21 fair (18) 37:19 70:6 101:16 120:5 140:13 158:8 160:23 162:19 184:12,13 189:6 190:6 195:22 219:14,21 220:2 223:21 224:14 fairly (1) 64:21 fairness (1) 220:9 fall (11) 33:16 39:13 70:17 129:23 146:15 148:21 153:5 166:10,15 204:10 219:11 falling (1) 230:4 falls (4) 8:17 65:14 102:10 224:4
--	--	--	--	---

family (1) 147:13	144:21 149:5	152:18 154:6	60:21 68:10,22	219:22
far (63) 4:5 8:13	152:12 162:9	156:12,22 158:13	69:3,12 71:14	fit (10) 63:3,4
11:12 12:21 15:5	163:15,20 164:12	162:14 165:5	79:6,7,16 81:9,18	112:11,12 129:5
15:16 17:9,16	165:17 166:4	166:7 168:2,8,11	82:10 83:6 86:18	130:5,6 164:15,17
26:15 28:20 29:5	178:7 180:3	179:18 181:20	91:4,15,17 94:14	186:2
29:6 33:3 36:14	185:18 187:21	183:11 185:12	95:6 96:17 97:23	fits (1) 62:8
40:16 50:20 51:19	220:21 222:15	187:15,19 188:14	98:14 109:7 161:4	five (13) 59:4 92:21
60:14,15 63:9	223:20 226:11	189:5 190:10,16	161:9 183:14	102:22,22 103:10
64:10 69:17 71:15	favor (12) 97:22	190:16 191:11	184:18 185:3	107:11 117:6
71:18,19 72:7	118:10 129:17,19	192:18 195:3,19	189:9 190:4	124:10,11,12,21
77:14 80:7 83:17	142:15 145:7	196:15,19 197:16	195:20 209:7,10	125:2 191:18
101:13,23 103:7,7	146:5 152:4 158:9	197:18 198:3,5	219:19 220:6	fix (1) 202:18
104:21,23 107:8	164:3 167:23	200:22 201:17	227:17	flatbottom (1)
110:8 131:22	226:19	203:21 205:22	filters (1) 223:17	53:12
137:22 149:17,19	fecal (1) 137:21	206:3,4 209:7,9	filtrate (1) 108:19	flexibility (1) 35:19
150:9 151:6 155:3	federal (2) 19:20	214:3 217:23	filtrex (1) 139:6	flip (2) 126:14
169:8 170:6,6,8,9	213:10	218:20,22 219:9,9	final (5) 56:12,17	182:8
170:18 176:2	feel (7) 58:10 61:11	219:15,17 221:2	67:3 175:23 208:5	float (1) 173:16
190:22 196:15	64:18,21 91:15	222:3,21 223:6	financially (1)	flocc (3) 16:2 172:2
199:18 200:5,22	112:4 170:10	224:5,16,20,21	72:21	172:3
201:17 206:22	feeling (3) 85:17	225:5,17 226:20	find (8) 11:6 71:4	flocculant (2)
216:9 217:8	116:14 230:3	227:16,19 229:4	74:23 79:21	171:22 172:8
221:20 222:15	feelings (1) 30:9	229:20 230:16	110:11 141:8	flocculants (3) 12:9
223:5	feels (2) 9:9 10:23	fences (13) 60:10	172:18 221:13	47:10 171:18
farmer (1) 69:10	feet (8) 102:2,16	60:10,13 67:16	finding (1) 220:16	floor (15) 11:10
faucette (72) 2:9	131:17,23 132:3	69:12 71:2 80:14	finds (1) 220:14	21:8 22:18 30:13
9:12 10:5 18:12	180:9 219:3 222:3	165:10 221:9,16	fine (16) 9:18 31:21	45:9 79:8 93:10
18:17 26:23 30:5	felt (3) 6:6 8:9	222:23 224:10	33:4 42:22 93:4	93:15,20 94:3,9
33:20 34:13 35:2	169:5	229:16	95:18 104:23	139:11 184:7
37:5,20 38:23	fence (112) 8:12,20	field (4) 35:19	109:13 126:7	209:23 210:8
41:16 48:9 55:14	8:23 9:3,4 10:17	169:8 182:11	128:7 166:23	florida (4) 108:6,9
56:22 57:5 61:11	49:17 51:4 52:2	209:6	167:2 210:22	115:13 163:21
65:7 74:15 75:13	57:11 58:6,12	figure (4) 72:13	219:16 222:10	flow (33) 8:5 48:17
75:18 76:21 78:5	59:15 60:6,7,15	123:22 126:5	223:3	55:7 62:22 74:14
96:3 98:11 99:8	61:19 64:8 67:13	229:2	finished (2) 99:5	75:8,23 83:18
99:15 107:7,15	67:15 70:9,20	figured (1) 226:4	172:15	87:8,11 93:23
110:15 115:6,20	71:5 80:7,14,18	figures (1) 78:16	first (25) 3:10 21:3	100:15 108:18
116:3,8 118:22	81:19 82:10 86:15	filament (1) 165:11	21:10 22:6 26:7	149:8 150:7,8
122:18,21 123:8	91:3,12,23 97:12	filaments (1) 165:6	26:11 31:16 32:11	169:12,21 173:14
123:18 124:9,11	97:13,19 99:20	fill (1) 209:15	86:19 115:15	175:12,16 176:12
126:18,23 127:11	105:18 106:16	filled (1) 24:14	122:16 132:13	188:16 196:11,16
128:23 130:20	108:14,23 110:9	filling (1) 227:21	142:10 143:4,11	196:19 197:8,10
133:12 135:20	112:11 117:9	film (1) 199:15	165:22 179:8	197:19,21 198:7
136:11,15 139:8	131:9 132:3	filter (40) 49:10	198:14,15 204:3	209:20 213:4
140:17 143:15	137:23 149:9,10	50:13 51:3 60:19	210:3,15,16,17	flowing (1) 175:14

flows (8) 48:18 55:2 75:6 87:7 100:20,20,22 194:17 flowthrough (3) 150:10 212:2 216:7 folks (6) 121:21 122:2 147:5 178:12 224:11 226:5 follow (3) 31:5 78:12 205:16 followed (2) 208:9 208:10 following (7) 7:6 55:21 82:16 116:4 136:6 171:17 206:22 follows (5) 105:4 113:21 114:11,20 114:23 foot (6) 183:2 192:12,13 194:6 194:11 214:9 forebay (1) 176:17 foregoing (2) 232:10,13 forget (2) 92:18 169:17 forgot (1) 131:18 form (3) 12:13 192:19 227:21 formal (1) 84:23 former (1) 20:8 forms (1) 174:12 forth (9) 40:10 109:8 117:14 159:19 196:21 221:21 222:23 228:2,22 forward (22) 13:5 13:8 26:11 33:23 51:13 61:5,15 63:15 64:4 68:4	78:12 79:2 90:20 95:16 139:17 140:22 142:15,22 152:22 178:20 198:23 213:16 found (8) 10:8 47:9 55:10 65:3 83:16 158:10 216:22 217:22 four (11) 47:20 61:18 107:11 113:14 117:6 136:4 138:20 155:15 210:4 222:22 227:5 frame (4) 58:22 107:21 134:12 178:9 framework (1) 222:13 free (3) 139:6 140:7 160:20 front (4) 72:10 102:14,16 208:11 frustrated (1) 186:10 full (4) 5:12 12:16 17:2 157:9 fullard (10) 2:10 15:18,23 39:7 43:15,19 64:7,12 65:4 98:22 fully (2) 212:11,15 fulton (1) 232:8 functional (1) 36:19 funds (1) 52:6 further (3) 41:7 102:10 140:3 future (5) 14:14 42:13 130:15 164:16 175:21	ga (1) 1:17 gallons (2) 109:8 213:4 game (1) 228:23 gate (3) 170:22 171:2,6 gauges (1) 53:7 gdot (9) 52:2,5 67:10 68:2,4,6 88:16 91:12 92:11 gdotw (1) 65:14 general (21) 3:22 10:9 12:6,20 20:23 26:3,6 31:5 34:22 39:9,20 40:3 46:8,12,14 60:14 120:9 142:8 146:17 162:6 170:9 generate (2) 5:9 99:22 generated (2) 78:14 82:17 generating (1) 100:4 generic (20) 30:21 40:4,10,11 62:14 68:18 69:8 70:4 74:19 89:10 96:6 96:10 97:22 98:14 98:16 102:10 170:8 175:10 177:12 188:2 gentleman (1) 223:6 geo (1) 170:4 geometry (1) 92:18 georgia (61) 1:11 2:3,5 3:9 5:21,23 11:13 17:12 20:4 66:16 73:4 74:23 75:3 98:4 102:9 106:6,18 108:6,16 108:17 109:12 117:8 118:11,12	134:23 141:12 158:15 175:8 198:21 199:3,20 199:21 200:3,3,4 200:5,11,12 201:13,14,14,17 204:23 205:2,2,2 205:3,5,10,20 206:19 207:6,22 208:17 218:8 219:10 221:8 222:16,18 223:2 227:21 geotextile (6) 8:23 60:11,13 108:22 110:7 211:7 getgo (1) 147:7 getting (18) 36:18 38:20 59:23 63:23 84:4 90:21 96:13 121:5 155:4 164:2 167:9 172:19 185:13 186:10 205:7 213:11 226:22 230:3 give (20) 4:18 12:16 16:19 22:5 35:19 70:19 83:5 93:5 102:17 109:22 112:20 115:14 150:14 157:8 180:22 191:18 197:23 224:15 228:13 231:5 given (1) 4:11 gives (12) 10:2 14:23 16:23 18:14 36:17 64:3 79:16 95:22 102:12 132:19 157:9 165:19 giving (3) 169:12 173:9 177:19 glen (4) 2:14 19:23	38:23 81:4 glens (1) 13:21 glossary (1) 23:18 go (128) 8:9 10:19 12:16 13:5,20,21 14:2,16 16:8,18 16:19 21:3 22:14 22:19 23:12 24:6 24:10 28:7 34:8 35:5 38:19 41:7 41:10 46:23 47:2 48:15 49:19 50:2 51:20 60:5 62:20 68:17 73:15 74:17 74:18,20,22 76:12 78:20 80:17,18 82:18 83:21 90:22 91:8 92:21 94:5,6 94:9,11 95:14 96:11 98:17 104:13 112:21 113:2 117:3,21 122:18 124:22 126:3,18 127:7,8 128:10 132:15 133:17 134:6,12 135:10 139:17 140:12,14 143:11 144:3 148:18,22 149:19 151:22 154:2 155:11,16 155:21 159:19 160:17,22 161:16 161:21 165:2 166:12,13,15 167:7,8,13 170:10 170:16 173:13 174:2 175:13 176:20 177:20 179:7 180:16 181:4,23 183:7 185:9 186:11,12 188:7 189:23 190:2,5,21,23 192:6 193:21
--	--	---	---	---

199:3 207:5 210:8 210:10 216:17 217:11,15 222:8 222:21 225:22 goal (3) 156:10 167:15 224:16 goes (20) 34:14 36:15 52:14 65:9 66:5 75:4 81:3 117:22 133:17 147:11 148:13 159:11 171:21 173:19 185:5 188:12 199:12 200:6 223:5 230:21 going (215) 9:20,21 10:18,20 11:3 12:23 14:20 15:2 15:4,6,8 16:3,12 18:11 19:8 21:4 25:15 26:3,9 29:13,20,21 34:8 35:10 36:21 39:15 39:17 42:3,12 44:3,8 45:14 47:4 51:5,20 52:6 54:8 56:13,14,14 59:12 59:15,16 60:14,16 62:5,21 63:17,23 64:2 66:22 67:7 67:13,15 68:17,19 69:21,23 70:3 71:4,8 72:5,20,21 72:23 75:6 76:16 77:9,10,23 79:10 79:12,13 80:6,10 80:16,17,20 81:5 82:13,22 83:4,7 83:20,21 84:12 87:23 89:6,6 90:2 91:11 92:21,22 93:12 94:15 95:2 96:2 97:4,5,10,17 97:18 99:2,11,22	100:3,20 110:12 115:2 116:22,23 117:21,23 119:3 121:9 122:11 123:15 127:4 128:8,10 130:3 131:9 132:19 139:15 140:5 141:14 143:17 144:3 145:15,21 147:4,6,8,15 148:20,22 149:14 149:22 151:7,7 154:2 155:18 156:7 157:7 162:20,22 164:13 166:6,7 167:18,22 168:17 173:11 181:2 182:11,17 183:23 184:4,21 184:23 185:2,3,4 186:11,12,13 188:14 189:23 190:2,5 194:16,18 194:21 197:5,9 200:10,11,23 203:10,15,22 204:14 205:6,15 206:19,19,20,20 207:14,17 209:22 210:6 212:10 214:12 216:6 217:2 218:16,20 218:21 221:12 222:7 224:18,21 224:23 225:2,8 227:3,11 228:4,5 229:7,21,22 230:6 230:19 good (32) 3:3 4:10 7:8 8:9 10:5 14:22 24:17 27:7 41:22 42:15 44:9 51:21 59:20,22 61:7 69:6,6 72:22	80:8 109:18 115:17 117:16 125:4 147:10 149:4,5 162:7 194:8 219:23 221:18 223:23 227:10 gorilla (1) 221:14 gosh (1) 108:11 gotten (1) 177:7 govern (1) 216:9 governance (1) 228:21 government (2) 3:4 106:7 governments (1) 57:19 grab (1) 217:11 grace (2) 230:10 231:5 gram (3) 195:5,5 228:2 grandfather (7) 56:18 61:18 64:13 79:10 83:2 132:10 147:6 grandfathered (11) 58:12,16 59:12 67:23 105:18 106:6 117:5 124:6 147:23 152:19 185:13 grandfathering (9) 57:13 67:9,19,21 68:3 107:9 151:12 152:5 158:10 grant (2) 161:8 164:7 graphs (1) 122:7 great (6) 54:8 115:23 155:5 205:3 222:11 230:15 greater (3) 25:21 149:9 154:5	greatest (1) 221:3 greatly (1) 102:9 greed (1) 23:17 green (14) 30:13,14 44:16 67:22 68:7 88:9,9 161:14,19 182:4 199:9 226:15 227:8,12 grids (1) 92:15 ground (2) 73:18 215:7 group (12) 48:15 87:18 110:2,11,14 110:19 111:12 114:9 120:18 157:23 173:12 219:16 groups (1) 104:23 growth (10) 136:2 136:6 158:14 159:4 160:8,11 161:15,21,22 162:3 growths (1) 162:11 guardrail (2) 66:22 66:23 guerry (3) 2:14 43:13 132:3 guess (16) 34:21 37:2 47:10 50:8 50:21 58:8,14 61:18 64:4 75:22 112:3 135:13 161:11 184:6 190:22 215:23 guessing (1) 144:4 guidance (5) 11:15 21:11 42:11 87:20 136:7 guidelines (5) 37:3 42:9,14 45:2 185:16 gut (1) 129:12 guys (36) 8:18 22:5 25:12 33:4 49:22	49:23 52:21 60:3 60:12,14 92:8,9 92:13 93:8,16 94:13,14,17,20 105:6 154:13,19 166:16 183:23 197:17,22 198:15 199:7,13 200:4 206:16 208:23 213:8,11,13 231:4 H half (4) 159:10 160:2,12 230:19 hamil (101) 2:10 9:22 14:2,5 31:9 53:23 55:3 56:18 57:3,8,18 58:19 66:9,13,18 67:5 68:21 69:11 70:8 70:20 72:18 73:8 73:13,16,23 79:19 80:4,12,23 85:2 85:18 87:5,10 105:14 106:11,15 106:22 107:11 109:23 113:14,19 115:12 116:15,16 117:4 118:19 119:2,10 123:5,17 123:20 124:5,10 124:14 125:5,19 125:22 126:12 127:12 132:9 134:22 135:16,18 136:2,8,14,23 137:3,8,12,16 138:6,13,17 139:6 140:3,5,23 141:4 141:11,16 147:11 158:14 159:6,9,14 160:2,8,11,15,19 161:2,22 162:5,7 162:21,22 163:6 163:14,18,22
---	--	---	--	---

hamils (2) 31:12 134:20	havent (11) 26:15 36:2 69:6 148:11 151:23 170:4 171:12 178:18 180:4 188:18 219:21	helps (2) 82:22 111:23	hours (1) 88:19	15:22 16:16 18:11
hand (20) 6:16 84:7 84:16 95:5 98:8 118:10 125:16 142:10,16 145:9 146:6,8 152:6 158:12 164:8 167:7,11 168:5 226:20,21	hay (8) 60:8 61:2 70:8 73:5 81:9,18 82:3 200:20	heres (3) 59:13,14 222:18	huge (3) 84:4,10 154:3	19:8 27:15,15 30:14 31:21 33:3 34:8 36:20,21
handed (2) 102:23 172:22	hazard (1) 66:22	hes (6) 30:18 34:8 38:10 40:6,16 225:7	hunch (1) 154:5	39:5 40:5 41:22 46:22 49:11 52:15 58:22 60:5 61:11 61:17 62:21 64:5 64:18 67:16 69:2 70:19 72:19,20
handful (1) 96:7	head (2) 173:18 189:15	hesitate (1) 216:21	hundred (8) 35:5 59:3 107:4 140:13 160:23 175:15 176:3 204:4	74:11 77:3 80:12 83:2 87:15 89:6,6 89:18 90:2 91:6 93:5 95:18 96:8 98:11 99:17
handle (2) 33:14 79:14	heading (1) 112:5	high (8) 46:8 75:6 128:19 169:12,12 169:21 196:11 214:22	hydraulic (2) 39:17 43:4	106:22 108:14 109:10 114:4,6 115:17 118:6 120:5 121:18,23 122:8,11,18 124:11 126:7,15 126:17 128:3 129:2,17,19 134:4 141:4 142:7 143:13 144:4 148:17,22 149:3 150:8,8 151:18 162:13 164:9 165:9,11 166:20 166:23 167:2 172:19 173:9 175:15 177:19 180:23 182:2,2,13 182:13,13 184:13 184:20,21,23 185:2,3,4 186:9,9 186:10 187:6 188:8,9 189:19 191:8,16,20 192:20 193:8,16 193:21 197:8 199:22 201:23 202:12 203:19,22 204:3 209:5 210:12,20 211:4
hands (3) 98:2 122:9 136:18	heard (21) 10:11 18:21 109:20 115:15 117:15 134:19 142:20,23 143:5 154:4,4 181:10 182:8,9 186:11,12,19 195:11,12 214:16 215:12	higher (9) 33:22 45:17 54:19 63:5 75:10 80:8,15 94:7 121:15	hydraulically (4) 28:14 43:6 45:11 114:14	
hanes (1) 170:4		highest (3) 62:23 75:13 127:22	I	
hang (1) 217:5		highway (2) 53:14 197:6	id (24) 3:10 14:12 15:14 35:4 52:2 53:22 60:2 62:11 63:11 66:9 79:5 85:2 121:20 122:2 124:22 128:7,12 128:13 130:10 139:13 147:14 148:18 203:3 225:15	
happen (4) 20:12 128:10 141:6 166:15	hearing (12) 5:18 18:22 20:20 21:20 46:21 61:11,17 104:7 185:11 188:8,9 193:16	highways (1) 196:12	idea (16) 7:8 10:2 24:15,17 33:6 61:7,7 83:23 91:10 109:18 112:16,17 129:5 150:20 169:9 224:7	
happened (2) 131:17 161:20	heart (1) 52:14	hilger (2) 1:16 232:19	ideally (1) 147:14	
happens (6) 24:6 38:12 94:16 203:16 217:8 218:2	heartburn (2) 108:22 109:12	hire (1) 204:23	ideas (1) 55:2	
happy (7) 33:9 52:15 63:18,19 167:19,21,22	heavy (1) 229:2	historical (1) 150:15	identical (1) 137:17	
hard (1) 53:18	hed (1) 51:15	historically (2) 153:13 188:20	identified (2) 15:9 202:23	
harder (1) 84:17	height (9) 69:18 80:8,9 151:3,9 184:10 196:3 215:10,13	hog (1) 1:10	ieca (1) 28:9	
harris (14) 2:14 22:5,8 24:8,11,20 155:21 156:8,20 157:12,17 165:21 166:3,23	held (5) 4:9,16 58:23 59:21 61:9	hold (8) 5:5 12:19 15:14 24:9 36:7 100:3 161:18 182:5	ill (13) 3:9 6:13,17 6:22 16:19 17:3 19:15 22:5 126:7 129:15 146:4 224:6 226:11	
hashed (1) 179:4	help (3) 7:12 111:12 203:4	holding (2) 59:19 61:6	im (151) 3:8 9:9,18 10:18,20 11:3	
hasnt (7) 69:17 112:19 135:19 136:3 146:12 151:19 227:18	helpful (2) 20:15 63:15	hole (2) 209:15,16		
hat (1) 217:5		holes (1) 173:14		
hate (1) 24:8		honest (3) 86:12 126:7 224:7		
		honestly (3) 15:23 126:19,20		
		hopefully (2) 4:21 100:13		

212:23 214:7,10 214:13,14 215:8 216:11 219:16,23 222:11 224:11 227:6,19 228:21 229:6,7 230:2,3 230:12 images (1) 89:21 immediately (2) 67:6 126:13 impact (2) 53:8 150:4 impaired (1) 149:16 implemented (2) 182:11 230:14 implied (1) 38:16 important (8) 6:7 11:6 34:19 82:20 143:16 200:5 210:9 225:14 impression (4) 83:5 84:19 229:18 230:5 inaudible (9) 80:21 82:14 91:14 113:9 141:11 146:2 150:11 189:7 196:4 inchandahalf (2) 180:14 181:4 inches (4) 214:22 215:3,6,14 include (7) 9:13 11:19 39:18 57:2 135:13 139:19 225:21 included (12) 42:9 46:11 59:16 68:6 76:2 90:19 95:23 135:14 136:13 141:10 207:18 229:9 including (3) 58:12 61:19 106:15	inclusive (2) 39:11 62:2 incorporate (4) 12:3 31:17 130:3 145:3 incorporating (1) 145:5 incorrect (2) 181:3 190:23 incorrectly (5) 9:9 86:18 92:8,12,15 independent (1) 91:20 index (16) 195:21 196:4 212:3,5,7 212:19 217:13,15 217:19 219:17,20 219:23 221:22 222:15 226:5,8 indicated (1) 119:11 indicates (1) 118:7 individual (6) 12:12,17 36:22 98:17 174:8 196:3 induce (1) 33:22 industrial (1) 211:7 industries (2) 136:2 158:15 industry (13) 6:7 19:19 28:12 81:6 154:2 198:5 199:6 204:7,19 205:12 205:12 211:8 213:14 info (1) 88:19 information (22) 5:7,14 17:9,12 19:5,18,18,20 21:22 25:5 29:7 36:12,14 59:20 60:3,4 63:19 102:17 105:11 225:22,23 230:6 infrastructure (2)	171:4,7 initially (1) 51:23 inlet (9) 168:19 169:2,8,13,23 170:12,13,14 196:20 inlets (2) 170:6,6 innovation (1) 33:22 innovative (1) 112:10 input (2) 203:4 229:14 inserted (1) 127:2 inspect (3) 43:2 151:7 216:18 inspected (3) 35:9 225:9,13 inspecting (1) 42:14 inspection (2) 76:9 77:11 inspectors (2) 78:7 78:9 install (9) 73:6 92:3 182:21 183:17 189:21 201:21 209:8 210:14 218:22 installation (31) 42:9,18 43:17 44:22 46:5,6 48:10 49:15 52:9 52:18 61:14 65:23 71:15,20 72:7 84:20 87:20 91:19 98:5 131:6,11,12 131:19 185:16 189:10 200:21 202:14,17,19,21 210:9 installations (1) 87:19 installed (54) 33:10 43:10,10 44:4,17	45:18,19 48:5 49:10 50:16 51:17 52:3,3,19,23 53:3 65:17 66:5 69:4 70:3,18,20 71:3 72:3,3 82:11 86:6 86:18 88:6,9,10 88:16,22 89:2,3 91:13,23 92:6,8 92:11,12,14 95:11 96:20 121:3,18 149:23 150:2 182:3 189:11 200:22 201:6 211:19 225:12 installing (1) 81:7 installs (1) 225:5 instance (2) 84:12 106:11 instruction (1) 89:4 insurance (1) 215:23 intend (1) 145:11 intent (6) 5:2,3 33:21 100:5 133:14 156:14 intention (1) 139:14 intentionally (1) 38:6 intents (1) 59:2 interest (2) 5:11 76:6 interim (2) 2:5 56:9 intermediate (1) 175:13 internally (1) 217:11 interpretation (2) 21:22 209:19 interrupting (1) 204:18 interval (1) 145:20 introducing (1) 123:19	inventory (3) 230:13,23 231:6 involved (3) 35:10 223:14 224:12 irregardless (2) 164:6,7 irrelevant (2) 42:14 153:17 isnt (8) 36:8 63:10 113:6 114:21,22 115:10,23 155:5 issue (15) 36:2 39:7 63:22 84:6 117:21 119:6 121:7 131:5 131:8 142:23 145:18 202:3,21 214:8 217:4 issues (13) 84:16 105:12,13 110:18 118:5 131:4,7 178:15 198:17,17 211:5,13 217:22 issuing (3) 23:10 35:17 200:15 item (17) 3:20 5:2,2 5:18 6:12 15:9,10 23:23 99:6 101:17 103:22 104:9 111:13 146:20 178:14,22 190:5 items (6) 3:12 5:4 61:18 97:3 164:15 164:16 iteration (1) 133:10 ive (26) 18:21 24:12,21,22 34:17 34:18,22 49:12 96:16 108:7 114:6 115:15 123:5 124:17 129:22 134:19 181:10 182:7,9 185:11 186:11,12 194:9 195:3 198:11 202:18
--	---	---	---	---

J january (22) 4:17 5:21,23 6:20 11:4 55:22 56:2,9,12 58:6 59:8 61:12 78:21 81:4 146:20 153:4 154:3 155:17,22 189:13 189:17 230:14 jean (4) 2:9 117:2 132:14 133:9 job (3) 71:12 225:7 225:10 jobs (1) 57:16 joel (11) 4:7 10:11 51:15 52:5 92:10 94:6 122:9,16 123:11 199:14 213:18 joined (1) 22:8 jordan (66) 2:9 14:6 19:9 20:12 20:18 26:15 32:18 33:12 38:9,19 62:4 78:10 82:7 83:12 84:2,8 87:2 88:4 90:21 97:8 100:5 104:2 112:9 116:17 119:12 120:22 122:7,20 125:10 126:21 127:18 129:8 130:6,12,21 132:21 134:4 139:13 146:18 148:13 149:2 151:18 152:20 153:19 155:6 156:13 161:3 162:2,19 163:4 164:9 165:13,23 166:20 167:6 168:7 170:19 178:11 179:4,14 179:23 180:4	182:3 186:21 193:2,4 jordon (2) 14:9 149:4 joshua (1) 2:11 justified (1) 231:5 K keep (13) 33:18 35:21 56:4 60:18 79:5 83:12,20 99:21 117:6 120:3 134:5 220:23 224:2 kelli (2) 2:19 198:13 kentucky (1) 175:7 kept (1) 13:17 key (3) 45:20 63:22 86:10 kicked (1) 133:4 kind (46) 8:22 12:4 34:14 51:18 59:17 60:11,16 67:14,21 69:4 71:8 72:10 76:9 86:11 91:19 96:16 97:13,16,17 113:5 126:16 138:3 145:16 148:3 149:16 150:11 154:11 156:13 169:13,14 169:16 175:16 177:8 179:13 198:18 200:6 208:20 212:5 217:20 221:13 222:10 223:17 224:17,22 226:4,7 kinds (4) 60:10 137:21 138:4 154:23 king (1) 20:5 kirby (4) 2:10 10:5 56:22 73:3	kirbys (1) 107:8 knew (2) 16:12 132:4 knife (1) 212:17 know (146) 7:10 8:5 12:23 14:19 15:2 16:23 17:22 24:21 26:15 29:6 29:7,10,14 36:12 37:13 39:19,22 44:8 45:14,15 49:23 50:15 51:15 51:19 52:5 61:7 63:11 64:10 65:18 65:21 66:3 67:16 68:20 71:9,23 74:17 75:16,16 76:3 78:16 79:2 80:2,6,11,13,21 82:23 83:4 86:19 88:5 89:4 91:3 92:10 94:23 95:20 95:22 96:18,22 97:16 99:9,10,20 101:14 103:12,18 110:3,8,15 111:23 113:6 115:16,17 120:5,6 121:23 129:11 135:3,18 136:17 137:5,5 138:4 139:12 140:16 141:18 142:6 143:8 144:5 144:9,19,21 145:22 148:19 149:14,16 151:8 153:11,16 154:10 155:3 159:4 163:23 164:9,13 170:5 175:15 180:19,23 182:16 182:20 183:5,6,8 183:10 184:12 185:5 186:13 189:14,16 191:12	196:15 197:14 199:8,18 200:6,9 200:10 201:3 204:3,3,4,14,15 204:16 205:7 207:9 208:11 214:12 218:6 220:9,11 224:19 225:2,19 228:6 230:17 knowing (4) 41:9 55:21,22 146:11 knowledge (2) 3:22 180:18 known (3) 9:16 11:8 141:21 knows (3) 71:6,7 222:22 knoxville (1) 174:16 L lab (15) 109:14 121:9 141:14,20 163:4,17 202:17 205:16,17,19 207:4,15,20 210:18 216:5 labeling (1) 15:5 labor (2) 73:10 189:21 laboratories (2) 28:9 108:4 laboratory (2) 100:12 108:3 labs (5) 108:20 109:14 202:11,12 204:19 lack (1) 121:22 lady (1) 209:15 land (1) 157:6 landdisturbing (1) 11:15 language (2) 44:3 59:17	large (3) 103:13 110:19 147:12 larger (4) 32:19 64:16 156:22 175:13 largescale (2) 153:15 225:20 largest (1) 24:6 larry (1) 211:6 lasting (1) 35:21 lasts (1) 228:7 late (1) 220:16 law (1) 17:12 layout (2) 18:5 150:12 leads (1) 203:9 lean (1) 226:13 learn (1) 107:5 leave (14) 17:4,6 31:9,11,13 49:18 66:18 71:21 82:9 94:2 96:21 147:8 170:19 186:7 leaves (3) 40:2 94:4 150:5 leaving (14) 13:10 13:11 31:13,21 35:16 41:22 42:2 78:10 82:7 84:2 96:8 97:22 195:4 219:23 left (8) 46:17 64:8 94:13 95:12 98:15 175:20 212:23 230:16 legitimate (1) 228:15 length (2) 106:4 107:3 lengthy (1) 124:12 letter (15) 30:10,18 112:18,20 113:4 124:23 134:11 156:14 165:23 201:18 202:4
---	---	--	---	---

206:17,19 207:3,5 letting (2) 155:14 155:17 level (5) 45:17 46:8 46:8 63:12,13 levels (2) 8:8 129:3 life (3) 42:11 158:22 169:15 lift (3) 40:15 45:16 229:2 light (2) 213:8,17 lightly (1) 90:12 liked (1) 174:17 likelihood (2) 155:3 204:13 limit (3) 58:17 144:10,11 limits (1) 34:20 line (8) 9:15 16:10 37:21 53:2 71:4 103:22 125:11 143:17 lines (1) 150:17 lining (1) 103:9 link (1) 23:10 linked (1) 16:22 list (61) 10:21 38:21 46:23 61:17 79:21,21 96:5 106:13,14 133:18 134:17,21,21 135:2,4,5,14,15 136:3,18 137:6,7 137:15 138:7,12 139:2,16,17,18,18 139:22 140:12,19 140:20,20,22 146:23 147:3,6,22 150:2 151:12,19 152:5,9 153:2,10 155:22 158:11 160:9 165:2 166:12 168:4,18 171:16 173:23 179:8,8,17 189:13	226:8 listed (8) 3:12 30:16 159:15 160:3,11 162:15 181:6 226:9 listen (2) 186:6 220:17 listing (1) 7:9 lists (3) 138:22 139:5,5 liter (2) 111:3,5 literally (1) 103:12 literature (1) 72:17 little (20) 11:21 24:20 37:6 40:2 55:7,12 59:10 76:17 107:15 111:11 125:2 133:22 143:21 166:20 168:21 183:15,16 212:6 222:17 223:15 live (1) 68:5 lo (1) 181:21 load (4) 149:10 188:14 231:2,3 loam (7) 55:13 74:12,13 75:5 76:8 84:3 93:19 loams (1) 55:10 local (8) 23:10 35:17 54:2 57:18 106:2,5,7 200:14 locally (1) 54:12 location (1) 20:8 log (3) 185:3 209:10,11 logs (1) 183:14 long (25) 4:20,22 4:22 14:17 15:8 31:4 33:10 36:7 40:13 61:15 96:15 124:7,21 125:2 126:6 129:14 158:7,20 159:14	178:11 195:4 221:12 223:10 225:3 227:18 longer (6) 35:20 47:8 93:12 158:7 191:23 230:17 longevity (8) 34:17 34:18,19,21 35:8 36:19 158:5 224:17 longterm (2) 40:12 41:13 look (33) 18:3 31:22 35:5 36:5 36:21 54:14 60:5 62:9,21 68:18 72:16,16 80:15 82:12,16 94:7 102:12,23 110:17 116:14 119:21 126:3 134:9 143:22 149:15,22 157:10,14 165:6 174:3 182:23 201:8 226:17 looked (10) 16:6 54:7,19 100:16,18 124:18 153:14 172:10,17 177:10 looking (20) 49:18 70:12,23 71:14 72:18 82:14 99:4 100:21 101:2,4 118:19 119:20 144:13 150:19 154:12 174:15 191:23 217:4 219:7 228:11 looks (7) 22:4 33:7 34:8,10 119:18 211:16 216:12 lose (1) 150:15 losers (2) 153:10 211:17 loss (5) 22:12,15,20	74:8 169:15 lost (3) 179:12,13 182:2 lot (44) 21:4 24:13 24:15 28:19 35:12 40:19 47:6 54:22 59:20,22 66:13 72:15 73:6 78:6 82:13 84:17 97:20 105:11 107:17,21 108:5,20 109:21 116:18 119:17,18 119:19 121:21 132:5 154:9 157:3 173:17 174:9 175:3 185:21 199:7 200:8 211:7 213:7,9 216:2 217:23 222:3 227:9 lots (1) 174:8 loud (2) 120:6 148:17 low (1) 111:2 lowbid (1) 189:20 lower (6) 75:23 100:19,20 148:19 191:11 197:21 lowering (1) 30:2 lowest (2) 7:18,19 lowimpact (1) 17:11 lucky (1) 224:6 lunch (5) 97:22 98:21,22 99:18 117:19 luther (1) 20:5	main (1) 131:5 maintain (6) 77:10 151:3,9 184:9 196:2,6 maintained (6) 52:10 149:23 150:3 151:4,10 225:12 maintains (1) 158:7 maintenance (2) 11:16 67:2 major (12) 7:4,9 26:8,12 46:22 47:8,15,20 55:8 58:13 99:4 168:18 making (10) 8:17 26:11 39:5 85:15 141:22 142:5 166:5 172:20 209:21 224:21 management (3) 4:14 17:10 26:9 manager (1) 2:5 mandated (1) 37:16 mandatory (1) 103:19 manner (1) 214:20 mano (6) 194:19,19 194:22 198:9,9,9 manual (78) 1:4 4:16 5:20 6:2,3,10 6:20 7:5,6 8:16,19 9:2 11:4 17:2 18:4 19:7,12 23:3 23:3,11,19,20 24:3 42:12 43:8 50:20 51:5,6,13 55:22 56:9,12,17 57:4,11 58:4 59:6 59:7,8 60:5 64:20 64:21 68:9 96:12 97:23 98:5,6,7 101:22 102:6,18 102:20 103:11
--	--	--	---	---

104:11 120:2 151:6 156:2 159:20,22,22 170:11,18 173:2,8 174:18 175:11,17 177:6,19,23 178:6 181:6 188:10 192:2 194:8 199:17 214:22 218:23 manuals (1) 19:7 manufacture (3) 230:9,11 231:4 manufacturer (20) 18:9,13 42:11 71:16,20 86:4 88:17,23 90:6 96:4 108:23,23 148:18 153:12 201:20 211:14 213:2 214:14 221:7 222:14 manufacturers (...) 18:14 42:18 44:4 44:17 45:2,7,20 45:22 52:20 70:7 71:23 74:23 84:11 87:20 88:7,11 89:3,11,15,19 90:6,8 92:18 99:11 140:22 155:22 183:12 184:2 185:16 188:4 190:11 218:8 221:15 230:22 manufactures (1) 230:20 map (1) 20:13 maps (4) 19:22,22 20:15 22:3 marc (15) 2:14 25:9 29:7 63:23 66:9 136:18 140:23 145:16 154:8	158:2 191:10 197:11 216:15 220:21 226:13 martin (1) 20:5 mass (1) 217:17 mastronardi (96) 2:14 25:11,14 29:15 32:6 33:5 33:17 36:4 37:9 37:19 42:8,17,20 42:22 43:5 49:13 50:8,21 52:7 53:5 53:20 57:9,17 58:2 61:23 62:7 62:16 65:22 66:12 66:15,20 87:15 88:12,18 89:2,13 89:18 90:2,10,17 99:17 101:10,16 103:11,17 104:13 117:12 118:16 124:2 125:3 132:2 133:8,13,22 136:19 141:3,5,13 141:18 149:6,21 150:14 153:3,9,20 155:13 156:5,11 156:16 157:20 158:6 188:8,19 189:2,6,19 190:11 191:22 193:23 196:5 197:12 203:6,17 204:6,13 215:7,10,22 216:20 217:10,21 220:5,9 228:9,13 229:12 match (3) 45:21 194:6 198:2 material (11) 30:19 39:2 203:7 222:16 224:2 226:3,3,4,7 226:14,16 materials (9) 9:13 34:13,14 39:3	40:9 62:6 111:20 218:11 230:22 math (2) 129:22 143:23 matrix (1) 88:12 matter (20) 8:14 32:13 33:3 55:22 58:2 62:12 63:8 76:13 86:10 94:16 99:23 118:18 126:11 161:3,20 178:13 203:7 205:17,18 209:18 matters (6) 8:15 142:10 177:18 178:14,18 215:19 matting (6) 12:2,7 26:12 28:13 29:8 114:13 max (1) 128:8 maximum (4) 27:4 27:9 29:3 183:3 mean (59) 8:13 9:8 13:2,14 15:8 36:11 37:10 60:14 62:16 68:9 80:15 91:19 92:17 96:13 97:11 101:12 103:13 105:21 109:19 121:10 126:8,14,16 128:19 134:3 135:13 144:2,5 145:12 146:7 149:3 152:8,14,18 155:23 158:6 165:8 182:22 183:8 185:21 186:6 194:18,20 195:2 198:4 199:22 203:14,18 203:18 216:9 219:22 223:7,10 223:13 224:5,9 226:6 227:5,20	meaning (3) 74:12 133:15 142:17 means (7) 11:21 37:6 42:2 83:7 126:6 161:13 209:8 measure (1) 62:19 measured (1) 139:20 measures (2) 46:14 181:17 mechanism (1) 191:4 mechanisms (2) 187:17 216:12 mediumterm (1) 40:12 meet (24) 8:23 9:21 36:9 38:11,20 64:9 78:21 83:18 130:8 132:12,17 132:20 136:4 149:17 150:10 154:20 156:21 167:16 175:23 185:17 197:20 204:5 207:7 222:23 meeting (266) 1:1,3 2:1 3:1,2,10,21 4:1,5,9,20,21,23 5:1,6,17 6:1,15 7:1,8 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1	47:1 48:1 49:1,14 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1,23 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1,19 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1,6,20,22 78:1 78:2 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1,6 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1,6 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1,2 99:1,2 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1,12 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 114:17 115:1 116:1,13 117:1 118:1,20 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 122:17 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1,16 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1 153:1 154:1 155:1 156:1 157:1 158:1 159:1 160:1 161:1 162:1 163:1 164:1 165:1 166:1 167:1 168:1 169:1 170:1
---	---	---	--	--

171:1 172:1 173:1 174:1 175:1 176:1 177:1 178:1 179:1 180:1 181:1 182:1 183:1 184:1 185:1 186:1 187:1 188:1 189:1 190:1 191:1 192:1 193:1 194:1 194:4 195:1 196:1 197:1 198:1 199:1 200:1 201:1 202:1 203:1 204:1 205:1 206:1 207:1 208:1 209:1 210:1 211:1 212:1 213:1,12 214:1 215:1 216:1 217:1 218:1 219:1 220:1 221:1 222:1 223:1 224:1 225:1 226:1 227:1 228:1 229:1,22,23 230:1 231:1,12 meetings (3) 110:8 150:22 195:17 meets (6) 32:13 33:7 38:14 40:11 40:14 221:17 member (8) 11:17 26:10 40:6 87:17 118:10 125:15 206:22 227:14 members (14) 2:8 3:6,11,22 4:11 5:7 19:6 28:2 34:4 145:6 146:5 164:3 178:20 226:18 memorandum (1) 58:4 memory (7) 35:2 62:8,21 64:7 122:12,18 203:22 mention (8) 18:12 39:2 42:8 44:21 85:4 97:13 145:17 198:18	mentioned (11) 44:9 50:11 57:3 114:19 115:12,16 189:8 191:10 220:10 223:15,20 merit (1) 35:12 met (7) 31:4 44:6 64:17 77:23 133:19 180:3 228:18 method (46) 28:4 43:19,20,22 45:22 46:5,6 48:10 54:11,18 57:12 64:6 73:21 84:3 84:21 104:16,19 105:10 106:21 107:16 108:7,20 109:6 110:17 114:2,7 115:18 116:21 118:9,15 119:6,12 120:10 125:4,4,7,9 126:8 180:17 191:7 200:21 207:10 208:9,13,16 211:11 methods (8) 57:7 99:22 110:14 118:14 125:14 178:17 179:2 208:18 metrics (3) 43:7 149:18 150:11 middle (5) 7:22,23 9:15 147:13 172:4 miles (2) 156:6 220:12 milligrams (2) 111:3,5 millions (1) 154:22 mind (11) 28:5 56:4 71:4 91:19 99:21 109:18 118:5 203:4	205:10 210:16 214:2 minimum (8) 9:20 31:4 50:9 119:23 130:8 183:3 192:14 215:13 minor (3) 11:12,15 19:4 minus (6) 9:18,19 9:21 130:13 143:23 144:3 minute (5) 81:3 109:8 195:12,15 213:4 minutes (2) 85:5 92:22 mirror (1) 111:22 misread (1) 215:8 misreading (1) 215:9 missed (1) 49:12 missing (1) 222:10 misspelling (1) 20:14 mistake (2) 220:15 224:21 mistaken (4) 16:11 187:6 214:10,14 mistakes (1) 106:16 mixed (1) 169:5 model (2) 23:8 115:22 moderating (1) 3:10 moderator (2) 5:3 16:17 modification (1) 3:16 modifications (2) 111:22 115:7 modified (13) 48:16 78:11,12 83:20 84:3 109:4 111:14 114:9 116:6 169:3	197:17 208:12,14 modify (1) 111:13 moisture (1) 121:14 moment (2) 19:11 184:22 money (7) 66:13 85:3 117:7 167:13 167:14,14 216:17 moneys (1) 91:6 monologue (1) 223:16 month (1) 35:16 months (21) 6:4 31:11 35:14,14 36:19,19 56:5 57:6 59:4 61:19 155:2,15 157:15 157:16,18 172:15 193:21 212:9 213:8 228:7 231:10 moran (36) 2:9 7:13,23 9:2,11 30:10,14,16 32:2 40:4 41:2,18 95:11 108:5 112:15 113:9 146:22 165:5,9 166:6 167:21 180:19 187:9,12 195:8 206:2,6,12 218:18 219:7 221:2 222:18 224:4,20 225:9 227:16 morans (2) 187:4 192:18 morning (1) 3:3 mountain (1) 1:10 move (18) 5:18 8:13 13:8 21:9 26:11 47:16 51:12 56:16 64:4 68:3 93:6 142:21	145:12,13 178:22 179:7 198:23 205:21 moved (2) 20:8 47:13 moving (12) 3:20 33:23 61:15 63:15 79:2 140:22 142:14 145:11 152:22 168:18 206:21 213:15 multiple (2) 108:3 123:8 municipalities (1) 24:13 N n (1) 2:2 naive (1) 225:4 name (6) 3:8 6:14 6:16,19 18:15 138:8 narrow (1) 53:17 nation (1) 205:19 national (3) 11:13 17:12 207:22 nationally (1) 141:13 nationwide (1) 83:21 natural (15) 21:12 21:23 22:9 136:2 136:6 158:14 159:4 160:8,11 161:15,20,22 162:3,11 228:22 nature (5) 19:22 22:3 37:12 53:15 110:20 near (1) 42:12 nebulous (1) 87:23 necessarily (6) 16:8 90:6 135:20 155:8 173:22 175:22 necessary (3) 155:6
---	---	--	---	--

176:14,21 need (73) 4:12,13 6:14 7:20 8:4,18 13:5 14:10,18 16:6 19:7,8 35:14 39:2 42:10 46:6 48:6 52:14,19 54:9 56:4,13,15 58:15 62:4,9 64:5 65:2,6 69:23 81:6 82:17 83:14,16,22 85:14 86:20 89:16 92:2 93:7 97:11 98:12 102:18 106:17 113:16 114:5 117:10 123:6 133:6 148:20 150:10 151:4 152:23 172:6 173:10 174:3 177:9 182:20 190:12 199:5,7 200:6,7 200:10 202:3 223:4 224:22 226:6 228:8 229:3 229:9 230:22 231:10 needed (10) 31:6,7 35:20 56:17 64:3 67:6 121:4 169:14 174:14 229:14 needs (29) 13:5 20:4,5 36:23 51:9 84:15,16 85:15 91:23 95:19 96:22 98:8,13 99:12 105:7 122:5 124:23 126:8,9 147:17 173:15,16 182:3 202:14,22 205:15 214:15 219:8 224:12 negative (2) 169:16 169:19	neither (2) 130:20 130:21 netflow (2) 149:17 150:11 netting (5) 36:7 212:12,14,16 231:2 never (5) 57:10 60:17 188:20 213:5 220:13 new (78) 8:16,19 9:4,8 12:7 13:17 14:3,21 16:2,7,12 17:9 18:4 27:23 33:7 44:2,4,15,18 57:6 59:3 61:5,14 62:15 63:2,3 64:21 65:11 78:20 78:21,22,23 79:18 83:13 94:6,16 96:14,23 97:23 101:6 102:19 103:12 105:13 106:20 112:10 120:2 132:11,22 134:8 135:22 139:20 141:7 151:16 152:7,10 152:13 154:18 155:17 159:20 161:13 168:4 172:13,15 174:22 176:6 177:3,16,22 178:3 198:3,5 217:18,19 227:3,7 227:12,18 229:15 newly (2) 11:19 82:17 news (1) 113:23 nine (6) 87:6 89:22 105:19 123:20 172:14 210:3 noi (1) 155:15 nomenclature (2) 13:17,22	nomograph (1) 25:15 nonblowout (1) 100:9 noncompliance (1) 216:23 nonpaved (1) 169:9 nonsensitive (56) 8:10 9:13 12:10 15:19 26:22 27:10 29:2 104:10 105:2 105:8 125:12 129:13,16 130:2 130:14,17,23,23 132:8,18 133:18 142:22 145:8 146:8 148:11 150:16,19 151:13 151:15,20,22 152:5,11,15,17,19 153:18 154:7 155:23 159:3 162:15 164:8,21 166:13 168:4,10 179:15,18,20 182:6 186:18 189:9 192:11 218:21 219:4 221:11 nontoxic (2) 30:23 31:2 nontype (1) 166:13 nonvoting (1) 87:17 nonwoven (5) 198:20,22 199:5 199:14,19 normal (1) 64:15 normally (1) 227:23 notarized (1) 113:4 notation (1) 71:22 notations (1) 71:19 note (9) 37:8 42:19 45:6,17 46:9	72:13,13 97:13 102:4 noted (2) 19:3 102:5 notes (1) 101:13 noticed (1) 209:14 novel (1) 42:13 november (1) 232:16 npdes (5) 159:21 169:16 172:15 174:8 176:3 nrcs (5) 21:19 25:22 48:11 73:5 226:16 ns (2) 104:17 119:9 ntpep (21) 108:14 108:16 113:10 206:20,21 207:5 207:14 218:8,13 218:16 219:9 221:4,13,18,20 222:5,13,16 223:16 225:20 228:3 number (61) 8:17 9:20 27:5,17 29:18,20 31:10,19 42:21 45:7 47:8 53:7 63:8 65:2,5 72:13 75:17 76:22 89:20 90:3,22 91:8 93:13 94:7,8 94:9,11 119:23,23 120:16 127:13 128:5,14,22 129:20 130:9 132:19 133:20 143:10,14,22 144:7,19 145:8 146:14 147:4,5 152:7 154:20 159:2,4,12 167:5 185:17 189:16 196:6 203:15	204:9 216:8 221:9 230:15 numbers (27) 8:14 10:3 19:21 49:7 51:2 62:21 65:20 75:15 77:2 126:5 128:11 129:15,17 129:19 130:15 132:6,18,22 133:7 133:11 140:11,13 143:18 145:19 146:11 148:20 169:10 numerics (1) 167:17 O o (1) 232:7 object (1) 91:6 objection (1) 53:16 objective (2) 134:14 161:13 obtained (1) 118:4 obvious (1) 92:20 obviously (4) 18:18 79:7 116:18 158:6 occurred (1) 67:4 occurring (1) 209:16 oconee (1) 1:9 october (236) 1:1,7 2:1 3:1,20 4:1 5:1 5:7,18 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1
---	---	--	---	---

45:1 46:1 47:1	179:1 180:1 181:1	184:6 186:17	122:5 134:7	68:5
48:1 49:1 50:1	182:1 183:1 184:1	194:2 200:19	230:22	outcome (1) 105:6
51:1 52:1 53:1	185:1 186:1 187:1	202:11 203:18	opposed (5) 118:13	outcomes (3) 77:14
54:1 55:1 56:1	188:1 189:1 190:1	210:20 213:22	124:11 128:14,22	77:16 119:18
57:1 58:1 59:1	191:1 192:1 193:1	215:17 221:8	144:10	outcry (2) 154:4,5
60:1 61:1 62:1	194:1 195:1 196:1	222:19 224:6	opposition (5) 98:3	outdated (1) 19:5
63:1 64:1 65:1	197:1 198:1 199:1	226:18 231:9	146:9 152:6	outside (6) 18:20
66:1 67:1 68:1	200:1 201:1 202:1	old (12) 21:17	158:12 168:5	33:2,16 66:23
69:1 70:1 71:1	203:1 204:1 205:1	48:10 62:23 68:9	ops (1) 230:20	77:5 138:11
72:1 73:1 74:1	206:1 207:1 208:1	103:11 141:4	option (16) 14:23	overall (1) 105:9
75:1 76:1 77:1	209:1 210:1 211:1	155:20 187:19	41:18 48:2 51:17	overlook (1) 34:9
78:1 79:1 80:1	212:1 213:1 214:1	191:7 214:9	56:11 70:19 78:18	overridden (1)
81:1 82:1 83:1	215:1 216:1 217:1	230:23 231:6	79:4 95:22 111:10	34:22
84:1 85:1 86:1	218:1 219:1 220:1	once (10) 59:9	169:13 171:9	overseas (1) 223:12
87:1 88:1 89:1	221:1 222:1 223:1	66:14 67:3 109:21	173:2 174:18	oversight (2) 18:18
90:1 91:1 92:1	224:1 225:1 226:1	112:16,18,18	176:11,18	199:16
93:1 94:1 95:1	227:1 228:1 229:1	165:21 225:19	options (4) 56:8,9	overview (3) 12:13
96:1 97:1 98:1	230:1 231:1	228:15	61:12,14	12:18 216:2
99:1 100:1 101:1	odd (1) 220:14	ones (18) 16:15	oranges (1) 120:15	owes (1) 91:13
102:1 103:1 104:1	offer (2) 52:11 85:6	47:4 59:16 68:16	order (8) 3:3 99:3	owns (1) 69:9
105:1,12 106:1	offering (1) 221:5	68:18 106:6	154:18 164:23	
107:1 108:1 109:1	office (1) 20:13	119:22 135:12,21	176:21 191:17	P
110:1 111:1 112:1	offices (2) 19:20	148:7 150:6,7	231:2,3	p (61) 2:2,2 7:13,17
113:1 114:1 115:1	20:8	151:23 153:5	ordinance (2) 23:8	9:6,22 10:3,6,17
116:1 117:1 118:1	official (1) 4:14	163:7 187:3	177:11	15:6 27:18 98:20
119:1 120:1 121:1	oh (1) 122:19	188:22 217:14	organization (1)	99:23 100:3,6,7
122:1 123:1 124:1	okay (63) 3:18 6:22	oneyear (5) 58:18	107:19	104:16 105:15
125:1 126:1 127:1	11:8 16:16 17:8	79:17 95:19,22	organizations (1)	119:5,7,8 120:16
128:1 129:1 130:1	20:22 21:9,20	97:4	111:19	121:22 125:17,19
131:1 132:1 133:1	23:5 25:2,19,20	ongoing (2) 157:7	orifice (1) 173:18	126:3,9,15,21,23
134:1 135:1 136:1	25:23 32:17 34:5	158:5	original (14) 27:6	127:4,7,13 128:8
137:1 138:1 139:1	37:22 47:12 57:22	online (3) 4:3 5:14	33:21 54:22 59:2	132:6,12 135:11
140:1 141:1 142:1	63:16 80:17 93:11	132:23	64:20 81:17 101:5	135:22 142:14
143:1 144:1 145:1	93:16 98:3 99:15	open (6) 6:11 60:12	110:8 113:7 151:9	146:7,8 148:16
146:1 147:1 148:1	101:10,16,22	71:10 104:12	175:4 184:10	150:18 151:16
149:1 150:1 151:1	102:4 118:13	127:5 150:5	226:23 230:21	152:7,10,13 159:2
152:1 153:1 154:1	121:9 125:17	opening (3) 64:19	originally (17) 8:4	159:12 164:14
155:1 156:1 157:1	127:3 132:4	213:6 219:18	31:19 54:18,21	165:4,10 168:4
158:1 159:1 160:1	139:23 142:9	opens (1) 34:16	55:15 60:23 64:18	178:8 181:14
161:1 162:1 163:1	143:17 146:9,21	opinion (6) 40:2	83:17 100:16,18	214:9 223:3,7
164:1 165:1 166:1	150:6 152:6	59:11 63:9 76:19	110:3,11 112:23	227:23 228:18
167:1 168:1 169:1	157:18 158:12,18	130:11 227:4	113:7 114:8	231:12
170:1 171:1 172:1	160:13 168:5	opportunity (9)	173:12 177:5	packet (2) 26:19
173:1 174:1 175:1	173:12 178:14	16:20 17:2 66:8	ought (5) 20:3	60:3
176:1 177:1 178:1	179:6 183:21	79:17 85:13 97:20	31:22 36:13 54:11	page (55) 2:18

20:10,17 24:11 26:7,14 27:3,21 40:5 46:11,12 47:21 74:6 99:7 101:18 104:11 168:20 171:14,16 171:18 174:20 175:18 176:7 177:4 179:9,10,21 180:6 181:9 182:5 183:21 184:20 186:5,17,23 187:4 187:10 190:8,10 190:18,21 192:10 192:15,22 193:8 194:2 208:11 211:5 214:2,3 215:3,15,17 230:8 232:12 pages (4) 132:5 170:12,14 232:13 paid (4) 85:11 91:16 163:6 164:6 pallets (2) 191:18 191:19 paper (2) 170:3 216:10 paragraph (3) 12:13,13 41:11 paragraphs (1) 41:6 parameters (3) 141:22 142:4 196:21 parker (75) 2:10 14:19 15:11 16:13 17:6 27:17,22 28:16,21 29:23 31:21 32:11 34:10 34:14 35:7 37:2 37:17,22 42:2,5 42:15 43:3,8,18 45:10,16 46:16,19 51:21 52:17 56:7 65:9,13,18 67:8	67:18 68:13 72:9 73:3,10 75:8,11 75:22 79:14 82:3 83:10,20 85:4,11 85:23 86:8,13 88:15,21 89:10,16 90:4 91:10 92:14 92:23 105:3 112:14 118:8,11 121:13 125:6 145:10,23 170:2 188:18,22 189:3 224:13 225:4,11 part (25) 5:15 25:14,16 44:11,19 51:13 53:13 57:11 57:14 99:22 100:3 104:19 111:21 120:13 139:3 147:13 173:9 181:10 189:19 191:20 192:15 209:21 220:17 221:5 223:17 particles (1) 77:14 particular (9) 38:17 57:21 97:3 106:10 121:4 146:20 188:3 204:20 212:19 particularly (1) 10:17 partners (1) 42:23 parts (2) 92:19 120:10 party (2) 163:3 207:10 pass (39) 15:9 53:6 57:7 61:21 68:7 69:22 70:9,10,11 70:13 71:5 75:21 76:7,8,14 79:23 80:5 83:8 91:16 100:2,19 187:11 194:22 195:2,6,16	196:8,23 197:3 199:9 200:11,11 203:10 204:10,12 204:14 206:11 207:2 225:2 passed (25) 22:4 50:16 60:7 79:7 86:3,14 96:19 100:22 112:23 135:12 181:14 186:14 187:6,7,11 193:11 206:9 208:19 211:9,15 214:5,11,15 224:8 224:9 passes (8) 61:16 80:8 129:10 134:2 146:10 152:7 203:7 206:11 passing (1) 99:21 pat (1) 6:15 path (1) 227:3 pattern (6) 49:17 67:14 70:22 94:13 94:21 95:2 patterns (1) 97:18 pause (3) 3:15 19:11,14 paved (4) 67:6 169:3,9,18 pay (12) 52:12 74:19 85:12,20 86:4,13,16 91:11 92:4 96:5 140:5 218:14 paying (5) 92:23 95:20 128:3 165:3 217:2 payment (1) 85:14 pays (1) 84:9 pending (1) 51:18 people (45) 9:21 14:22,23 24:15 28:8 29:20 36:2 45:14 54:2 55:9	68:19 72:15 77:21 80:14 82:22 85:6 94:17 102:5 106:17 109:11 119:19 120:2,18 128:6 135:7 139:4 142:2 153:9 160:6 163:11 166:21 170:10 172:9,20 176:10,11 177:12 185:20 202:9 205:2,15 217:8 218:2 230:8,12 percent (42) 9:23 27:11 35:5 48:19 49:8 59:4 63:2,2,5 65:10 76:5,15,17 77:20 79:3,3 83:11,14,19 94:12 94:20 100:15 101:6,7,9,14 105:16 109:7 125:20,23 127:7 127:12 140:13 151:3,8 160:23 175:15 176:2,3 184:9 196:2 204:5 percentage (1) 41:16 perfect (2) 82:19 187:13 perforations (1) 228:16 perform (6) 48:4 48:11 80:11 184:5 203:11 228:5 performance (59) 13:3 16:4 26:16 28:2,17 30:2 31:22 32:3,14,15 33:21,22 36:10 38:11,14,21 43:7 44:7 45:19 46:3 47:21 48:13 56:3 62:18 65:7,15	76:15,22,23 77:4 77:6 82:15,20 83:10 90:22 91:5 93:9,13 97:10 101:20 104:10 108:9 109:5,16 117:13 145:21 167:16,17 168:20 168:23 170:9 221:22 222:9,11 222:12 225:23 227:2 228:11,23 performancebas... 16:15 43:9 46:7 performs (3) 33:8 65:18 228:8 period (33) 36:10 36:11 57:14 95:19 97:4 132:10,16 133:2 134:10 140:16 147:23 148:6,7,8 154:14 157:13,21 158:3,8 162:18 164:4,5,23 168:3 178:16 179:17 185:14 186:16,17 206:18 216:10 230:10 231:5 permanent (1) 66:10 permanently (1) 66:19 permits (7) 11:14 17:13 172:15 174:8 176:4,14,21 permitted (1) 178:9 permittees (1) 171:9 perpetually (1) 133:11 perplanbyhyperpla... 137:2 138:21 person (6) 85:19 100:11 184:11,14
---	--	--	---	---

200:9 218:5 personal (1) 227:13 personally (1) 118:2 persons (2) 30:6 210:21 perspective (1) 150:15 phase (3) 18:4,5,5 phrased (1) 120:9 physical (15) 216:5 221:20 222:8,19 222:20 223:5,13 224:12,15,17,22 225:16,21 226:2 226:19 pick (5) 14:23 40:13 106:3 113:11 120:9 picked (1) 29:19 picking (2) 150:9 211:17 picture (2) 89:9,23 pictures (3) 11:20 26:5,6 piece (7) 35:23 133:23 173:8 193:10,17 216:10 217:12 piedmont (3) 20:13 20:14,22 pipe (1) 169:7 place (10) 6:6 39:14 41:14 54:17 55:16,19 78:20 81:18 139:16 175:21 placed (1) 196:16 placing (1) 196:18 plan (11) 19:2 24:14 37:4 44:11 59:14 78:3 137:3 137:10,14 138:11 215:11 planbyplan (1)	138:16 planning (5) 37:17 39:8 103:17 155:10 156:14 plans (29) 6:8 17:17,20,21 18:4 18:4 44:8,19 52:4 138:7 153:21 154:9,14,23 155:12,15,19,19 158:19,22,23 159:6,8,9,13,15 160:3,12 217:20 play (1) 148:19 played (1) 161:4 player (1) 156:6 plays (1) 157:21 please (1) 9:10 pleased (1) 63:13 plenty (3) 62:10 88:19 157:14 plot (1) 203:2 plug (1) 209:16 plus (8) 9:18,19,20 54:3,5 106:8 144:3,4 plywood (1) 133:23 point (45) 5:13,21 10:5 18:21 24:3 32:13 42:15 47:11 51:12 52:7 57:9 58:23 61:20 76:10 88:3 89:5 103:5 104:20 107:20 112:3 117:19 119:8,9 121:17 127:22 128:19 133:23 139:13 149:4,5 153:8 155:19 161:12 171:11 182:7 188:9 191:22 192:3 203:23 207:16 211:3 216:14 217:10	225:15 228:19 pointed (1) 37:20 points (4) 104:18 117:15 129:20 144:7 policy (1) 167:23 pollutant (2) 11:14 17:13 polyacrylamide (4) 47:8 171:21,21 172:7 ponding (2) 169:20 197:7 ponds (1) 176:15 poof (1) 224:8 pool (1) 84:4 populate (1) 141:23 position (2) 52:14 157:18 possibilities (1) 139:4 possible (5) 6:5 55:11 67:7 101:2 138:23 possibly (8) 8:11 51:16,17 130:16 149:13 163:12 166:18 196:22 post (10) 180:8,14 181:15 184:5 189:23 191:6 192:3,8 193:6 194:5 postconstruction ... 17:10 posted (4) 4:2,3 5:10,14 posts (3) 181:4 189:7 191:13 potential (4) 4:13 6:20 111:10 169:19 potentially (6) 10:13 67:9 79:11 82:13 130:19	226:14 pounds (5) 192:12 192:13 194:6,11 228:2 practical (1) 189:14 practice (9) 4:14 88:8 96:4,6 104:22 172:13 176:6,7 177:3 practices (5) 16:8 26:9 171:7 176:10 177:16 practicing (1) 96:16 preclude (1) 15:15 precluding (1) 26:10 predominantly (2) 7:10 189:23 prefer (2) 47:7 212:13 preferred (1) 169:21 prerogative (1) 106:8 present (3) 2:8,13 98:22 presentation (7) 4:6,11 36:13 89:14,19 90:5 135:6 presentations (2) 54:6 118:20 presented (17) 3:11 3:19 8:4 13:10,12 23:14 59:5 63:20 105:11,13 112:8 119:6 122:9 125:15 170:21 171:15 190:15 preserved (1) 103:14 pressure (2) 80:10 80:19	pretty (12) 54:7 59:13 84:16 111:17 134:13 144:14,15 170:17 177:10 179:5 200:5 205:11 previous (18) 30:6 30:7 34:15 48:10 49:14 72:14 73:7 76:19,20 84:15 110:16 111:21,23 116:18 133:9 195:14,17 223:21 previously (6) 30:3 75:23 154:4 161:11 177:23 217:16 price (6) 123:15 191:11,19 214:8,8 230:17 print (3) 218:20 219:2,5 printed (3) 20:7 23:8 218:20 prior (7) 23:2 50:20 68:11 121:18 164:6 170:7 192:23 private (1) 163:17 pro (1) 35:17 probably (27) 15:11 36:17 37:6 72:23 77:7,22 78:14 83:3 85:5 99:12 111:11 123:11 128:13 129:19 132:19 141:9 144:9 155:5 156:5 162:11 178:8 186:2 198:21 205:6 220:19 223:7 225:4 problem (16) 8:17 19:9 32:2 33:16
--	--	---	---	---

34:21 73:20 78:10 84:2 116:17 119:13 146:22 201:6 204:17 220:2 221:23,23 problems (3) 40:16 47:4 103:23 procedure (2) 121:2 161:22 proceed (4) 41:21 93:18 115:3 119:2 proceedings (2) 232:11,15 process (22) 8:15 10:8 34:18 38:20 57:13 59:19 61:10 120:3 136:12 141:23 157:8 159:18,19,21 161:14,15,16,19 190:22 202:18 208:16 216:6 produce (2) 5:12 165:3 produced (1) 125:14 producing (1) 220:11 product (137) 7:19 7:19 8:22 12:4 17:16,19 18:12 32:18 33:7 35:9 35:13,22,23 37:15 38:11,14,16 39:13 39:15,16 44:2,4 44:15,15,18 50:15 50:18 57:19 61:9 62:2 69:20,22 70:2 71:6 72:8 75:2 76:4 77:20 77:22 85:23 86:2 86:3 88:21 96:3 96:15 98:12 105:19 106:10,13 108:14 112:7,10	112:19,21,23 113:5,6 114:14 122:21 123:21 132:15 137:22 138:8 139:16,18 139:18 140:5 141:16 147:16 148:22 151:2 152:15 158:19 159:15 161:5,13 161:21 165:4 179:17 180:10,15 180:22 181:3 182:17,21,21,21 184:4,10 185:22 186:21 187:4,13 187:23,23 188:3 190:12 191:15 193:9,11,20 196:9 198:3 199:9 200:10 202:13,22 203:18,20 205:4,4 205:9,14 210:21 211:15,19 212:4,6 212:8,10,11 213:2 214:4,6,23 216:4 223:9 225:8 226:8 227:6,7,16,20 230:13,18,19,20 products (144) 7:22 8:16,19 9:13 28:13 30:23 34:12 35:18,20,21 36:6 36:9 39:10,19,21 39:22 43:4,9 44:16 45:11 50:10 52:19 56:19,23 57:6 59:3 61:5 64:13,19 67:8,19 67:21 68:8 70:16 78:21,22,23 80:20 82:14 91:2,2 96:14 97:9 98:17 102:19 105:17 106:8,13 111:16	112:6 113:15 114:12 117:4,7,19 120:12,14,15 124:5,15,19 127:23 128:20 129:4,23 130:16 132:10,11,22 133:4 134:7,9,11 134:16,17,17,20 134:22 135:5,11 135:14 136:3 137:16,19 139:2 139:16,22 141:23 142:10,12 143:19 144:13,16 146:13 146:17,23 147:15 147:18,19 148:4,5 149:12 150:21 151:12 152:19 153:4 154:6 159:20 162:15,17 162:18 167:12,16 168:2,2,8,12 173:23 180:2,6 181:11,16 182:10 183:11 185:10,21 186:22 187:2 189:15 192:5 193:16 198:5 209:4,4 210:3,5 211:8,23 224:18 227:7,12 229:9,15 230:9 professionals (1) 6:7 program (3) 2:5 207:23 230:21 progression (2) 228:23 230:2 project (7) 35:15 36:22 150:9,12 157:8 176:13 216:4 projects (5) 53:11 124:17,18 157:4	158:5 promise (1) 216:11 proof (1) 86:20 proper (3) 72:7 178:12 180:7 properly (17) 48:6 49:11 50:17 52:23 66:6 72:3 88:16 88:22 89:3 91:13 95:11 125:9 149:23 173:20 181:15 182:22 225:12 properties (30) 22:2 77:13 195:21 196:4 212:3,5,7 212:18,19 217:13 217:15 219:18,20 219:23 221:21 222:8,19,20 223:2 223:5,13 224:12 225:16,22 226:2,5 226:9,19 229:8,8 property (6) 112:22 140:17 224:15,17,23 229:8 propex (1) 218:9 proposal (1) 228:15 propose (6) 15:14 17:3 18:22 23:4 23:13,17 proposed (10) 11:19 19:16 22:21 23:21 24:5 34:6 132:8 169:22 170:20 172:12 proposing (1) 134:4 proposition (2) 55:18 66:17 props (1) 22:6 protection (6) 12:9 25:17 169:14 177:3,9 196:20	prove (6) 79:17 86:17 91:23 173:10 184:4 207:19 proven (3) 82:5 208:21 211:11 provide (1) 56:5 provided (13) 5:8 6:23 21:23 25:5 44:5,7,19 87:20 88:19 95:19 117:18 122:15,16 providing (2) 229:15 230:6 public (19) 2:17 4:3 4:8,22,23 5:5 17:15,23 22:13 74:2 120:9 167:23 170:2 177:6 178:16 179:7 194:4,9 213:23 publics (1) 3:22 published (1) 208:5 pull (2) 156:21 228:19 purchase (1) 180:22 purpose (2) 62:17 171:3 purposes (1) 74:19 pushing (1) 205:3 put (79) 12:11 17:17 32:23 34:20 35:22 44:3 51:3 53:18 56:12 57:19 59:11,12 64:9 66:14 69:18 72:5 72:20,22 78:6 82:23 106:14 110:6 114:14 116:5,18 121:6,8 121:9,11 127:4,14 128:13 133:18,23 134:18 136:17 139:23 141:21
---	---	--	---	---

147:22 149:18 151:6 152:16 158:15,16,19 159:6 161:17 169:6,8 170:3,11 173:2 175:11 176:10 178:8 179:21 180:15 181:23 182:18 185:4,8 192:19 193:10,17 196:2 205:4 213:9,13 219:4 222:5 223:8 223:12 226:7 227:10,22,23 228:4 229:19,23 puts (2) 209:9,10 putting (9) 41:9 72:12 78:8 95:18 114:13 122:8 149:13 160:15 226:14 pvc (1) 173:13	216:12,12 quarry (3) 66:16 69:9 73:15 quarter (1) 174:10 question (59) 13:21 37:9 38:4,5 44:9 51:5 52:8 58:8 65:16 66:10 70:18 72:2 73:13 78:9 79:22 80:7 82:11 84:6,8,10,11 87:5 87:16,18 91:11 95:5 107:7,23 117:14,23 120:22 123:5 124:5 125:13 127:18,20 131:10,19 143:4 145:10,14 146:4 147:10 148:13 153:3 156:9 158:14 162:22 165:2 172:6 186:5 189:8,12 190:6 200:19 203:17 214:4 215:12 217:3 questionable (1) 84:21 questioned (1) 61:3 questioning (1) 214:17 questions (21) 5:17 17:14 21:15 24:23 43:21 46:20 48:21 51:7,10 68:16 69:3 72:7 79:3 101:18 116:22 117:2,17 169:22 174:5 213:20 215:19 quick (1) 230:8 quite (4) 4:21 107:21 230:12,12 quote (3) 99:21 216:7 224:9	quotes (1) 59:13 R r (3) 2:2 232:3,7 rainfall (10) 55:4 87:8 105:20,21 106:3,23 107:2 123:7,21 124:19 rainfalls (6) 87:6 106:3 113:17,19 123:6,9 rains (1) 114:12 raise (13) 6:16 98:2 98:8 118:10 125:15 142:15 145:9 146:8 152:6 158:11 164:8 168:5 226:20 raised (4) 87:18 104:14 124:4 150:20 raising (1) 22:16 ran (1) 123:14 random (1) 216:3 randomly (1) 139:9 range (1) 130:5 ranges (1) 130:2 rate (9) 8:5 87:8 108:19 149:8 150:7,8,10 173:11 188:16 rates (6) 44:23 74:14 75:8,23 93:23 212:2 raw (1) 5:9 reach (1) 149:10 read (7) 6:16 32:3 37:18 39:8 103:12 121:13 170:4 readed (1) 210:20 reading (2) 27:16 74:11 reads (1) 169:16 ready (5) 6:19 93:6 156:23 164:9	166:19 real (6) 87:13,15 119:3 211:3 228:14 230:8 reality (3) 66:2 111:13 186:2 realize (1) 213:14 reallife (1) 50:4 really (26) 8:15 15:7 18:6 29:4 34:11 39:20 52:4 62:12 69:9 86:21 103:13 110:17 126:11 127:18 130:12 131:5 153:23,23 157:22 191:12 198:16 199:5 205:14 209:13 216:19 219:8 realworld (4) 110:21 203:2 209:5 211:2 reason (9) 8:2 16:13 41:5 116:19 121:11 163:9 186:9,10 201:10 reasonable (2) 134:12 157:13 reasonably (1) 53:5 reasons (3) 55:14 111:8 224:13 recalculate (1) 148:14 recalculated (1) 93:13 recalculation (2) 31:18 49:5 recalculations (1) 65:3 recall (3) 50:12 147:4 196:11 recap (1) 49:11 receive (1) 212:13 received (4) 4:8	21:11 171:12 177:22 recess (3) 98:21,23 168:16 recognition (1) 204:8 recognize (4) 6:18 58:5 204:19,21 recognized (3) 6:17 57:12 153:5 recognizes (1) 138:23 recommend (3) 27:9 63:18 84:13 recommendation... 27:6 29:5 30:2,6 31:12 45:20 48:19 49:8 52:20 58:14 60:15 61:4 62:23 63:2,3,17,21 65:7 65:12,14 71:23 81:5 83:13,14,17 85:15,16 86:6 88:7,11 89:12,15 92:18 93:5,5,7 94:5 95:3,13 96:10 98:4 99:19 101:6,7,13 124:9 129:21 132:7 134:20 146:16 162:14 166:5 184:2,3,15 199:4 201:9 220:22 225:16 recommendation... 4:17 31:8 37:8 45:8 89:20 90:7,8 94:19 99:12 146:21 170:18 215:20 218:17 227:15 recommended (2) 45:22 216:15 recommending (5) 106:20,22 107:8
---	---	--	---	--

136:11 224:2 reconsider (2) 211:12 213:15 reconvene (2) 98:19 168:17 recps (1) 44:22 recruiting (1) 141:6 recycled (2) 40:18 138:3 red (1) 16:9 redo (4) 68:17 93:2 112:22 202:20 redoing (1) 204:2 redone (3) 26:5 51:22 162:4 redraw (1) 155:11 reduce (1) 192:19 reduced (1) 232:12 reducing (1) 48:17 reduction (5) 10:7 62:13,18 76:5 77:21 reece (6) 2:10 33:6 34:8 36:20 52:8 89:13 reevaluate (1) 124:23 reevaluated (3) 97:6 122:6 145:22 reference (5) 5:22 24:4 62:11 97:9 98:6 referenced (1) 17:19 references (3) 24:2 24:2,5 referencing (1) 17:16 referring (4) 11:13 41:10 111:12 199:11 reflect (2) 155:20 208:10 reflecting (1)	208:13 refresh (3) 35:2 64:7 88:4 refuse (1) 57:19 regarding (22) 4:16 11:15 13:3 18:22 19:5,18,21 21:13 21:15,21 23:5 25:7 28:17 46:21 49:15 51:12 84:6 101:18 104:14,15 178:16,19 regardless (7) 8:20 86:14 96:19 105:5 137:23 142:18 203:15 regards (1) 100:2 regulated (1) 156:19 regulation (1) 149:19 regulator (2) 58:3 64:12 regulatory (1) 37:15 reinstall (2) 217:23 225:7 reiterate (1) 229:7 rejected (1) 200:20 related (8) 17:12 51:11 63:12 126:10,17 168:19 178:7 225:23 relates (3) 26:8 177:19 225:18 relevance (1) 145:23 rely (1) 58:4 remain (3) 5:2 164:23 168:3 remaining (1) 167:5 remember (21) 4:6 18:11 54:22 64:11 75:15,17,20 81:11	97:11 110:7,15 121:3 122:23 128:23 133:12 136:9 153:20 187:7 188:13 193:14 203:23 remind (2) 6:13 61:23 reminded (1) 48:14 removal (6) 10:7,14 26:12 70:14,14,15 remove (8) 18:8 40:22 66:13 72:21 73:16,19 217:23 220:12 removed (7) 15:5 18:16 48:3 67:3 75:13,19 103:23 removing (2) 32:12 66:16 repack (1) 202:19 repeatability (3) 211:5,10,13 repeating (1) 149:7 rephrase (1) 119:4 replaced (6) 9:23 11:20 26:5,13 151:5 170:14 replacing (1) 35:22 replicate (4) 110:21 123:11,12,19 replicated (1) 109:17 replicates (3) 123:10,10,13 report (7) 5:12 208:4,5,7,13 225:23 226:6 reported (1) 232:11 reporter (5) 1:17 3:23 6:14 90:13 232:20 represent (3) 89:11 127:9 232:14 requested (1)	201:11 requests (1) 199:6 require (7) 24:13 108:2 151:15 165:13 166:20 196:7 222:2 required (8) 53:4 121:16 180:16 182:18 192:17,22 193:21 215:13 requirement (8) 132:20 152:20 172:22 195:9 200:17 218:10 219:8 221:20 requirements (7) 32:14 33:14 34:3 42:7 138:20 190:13 228:19 requires (4) 5:23 202:20 221:8,17 requiring (2) 168:2 185:9 rerun (1) 51:16 research (1) 25:16 reseller (1) 182:14 reset (1) 148:16 resetting (1) 6:5 resolution (1) 51:18 resource (6) 21:12 22:2,9 149:11 150:4 188:15 response (3) 4:7 6:21 168:13 responsible (1) 196:14 rest (1) 110:10 restate (1) 6:18 rested (1) 98:8 restoration (1) 176:13 restrain (1) 89:7 restrict (1) 33:23 result (6) 36:17	53:6 66:3 109:22 123:3 228:11 results (40) 46:4 52:12,12,15 58:10 58:11 63:14,20 64:22 76:2 85:9 115:14 118:3,15 119:7 121:22 122:11,14 142:14 145:12 146:6 165:6,6,9 167:10 178:17,19 179:2 188:11 197:22,23 204:8,12 210:23 211:12,20 212:8 212:23 214:10 221:18 resume (1) 121:6 retained (8) 10:2 105:16 125:20 126:2,10,12 127:7 127:12 retains (1) 188:16 retention (2) 10:14 169:12 retest (28) 49:21 52:11 62:5 74:20 74:22 75:2 80:19 82:9 84:15,16,17 86:4 91:3,4,7,17 92:2 95:14,17 100:5 113:2,8 140:12 160:22 165:21 188:7 201:2,2 retested (15) 51:23 61:20 64:5 79:13 83:4 98:12,13,18 99:20 165:14 167:4 168:6 185:15 192:22 193:5 retesting (12) 79:18 79:18 82:8 84:7,7 84:12,14,20 91:11
---	---	---	---	---

97:10 134:6 190:22 retrofit (2) 170:22 174:14 review (12) 3:13,20 4:3,5,13 24:14 56:11,14 91:20 178:23 179:3 213:12 reviewer (1) 137:11 reviewers (1) 137:14 reviews (1) 155:19 revise (7) 14:18 31:6 83:14,16 93:12,22 156:2 revised (12) 17:8 22:11 47:20 62:21 65:3 83:15 94:6,9 94:11 128:5,11 170:21 revising (1) 1:4 revision (6) 21:19 26:12 47:8,15,20 168:19 revisions (9) 7:3,4 16:5 19:4 26:7,8 46:22 47:18 99:4 revisit (3) 97:10 100:6 131:3 revisited (2) 62:5 65:6 richard (1) 175:6 richardson (3) 2:15 44:21 67:2 rid (1) 230:23 ridiculous (1) 198:11 right (113) 9:8 14:9 14:21 15:11 16:15 18:15 27:14 30:12 32:22 33:19 36:20 37:2,6,18 40:9,15 40:16 43:5,17 50:6 57:14,17	60:20 62:16 65:4 65:8 67:20 69:2 69:16 71:10,12 78:8 80:5 81:20 82:6 83:3 88:14 102:13 107:3 115:20 116:5 118:14 120:7 123:17 125:16 126:16 127:11 128:15 129:9,11 130:22 134:2 135:15 136:14 142:15,19 144:23 145:9 146:4,8,9 146:23 147:4 150:5 152:6,22 154:7 156:11 157:20 158:9,11 163:2,9 164:8,11 165:18 168:5,8 172:4,14 173:14 173:15 179:6 184:20,22 189:2 189:19 193:23 194:13 196:11 197:4,11 198:4 199:21 202:5 204:3,6 205:23 208:4 216:11,20 217:10 219:13 220:10 221:4,6 222:19,21 223:2,6 228:23 229:3,21 rigorous (1) 73:12 ring (1) 122:14 riprap (7) 23:5 24:12 25:11 103:8 103:10 199:2 200:8 risk (4) 149:9,12,13 220:16 risks (1) 197:14 road (6) 1:10 128:2 128:4 129:5 216:4	217:4 roadside (1) 66:21 robert (2) 2:18 179:8 rock (9) 49:20 63:4 68:18,20,22 69:7 100:21 198:19 199:12 rocket (1) 224:6 roger (1) 213:22 role (2) 87:16 200:5 roll (13) 39:15 110:5 180:11,11 180:12 181:20 185:2,3 186:6 187:18 189:22 192:18 230:18 rolled (6) 43:3 45:11 86:2,3,15 88:21 rolling (1) 145:16 rolls (3) 153:4 155:17 230:15 room (6) 86:12,22 87:14 95:21 98:2 221:14 roughly (2) 123:12 155:16 round (2) 150:22 219:22 row (5) 14:16 54:4 69:12,13,14 rpr (2) 1:16 232:19 rules (1) 186:8 run (37) 25:17 28:8 53:22 54:18 55:16 55:19 66:6 75:23 94:18 100:10 105:22 106:18 107:20 110:4 111:7 112:18 113:11 119:20 121:4,18,19 122:22 123:20,22 139:6 140:6,23	141:12,14,17 145:2 163:12 169:3 185:20 186:20 220:16 221:12 running (4) 48:18 102:20 145:7 163:19 runoff (2) 21:13,15 runs (3) 105:19 121:7 122:22 runthrough (1) 172:16 rusle (1) 170:8 ruzowicz (217) 2:5 7:17 8:2 9:7,17 11:22 14:12,21 15:22 16:11 17:15 18:3,10,14 20:7 20:11,17 21:17 22:13,19 25:9,12 25:19 26:18 27:3 27:14,20 28:6,19 28:22 29:4,17 30:4,15,20 31:16 32:17,22 33:15,19 34:2 35:4 38:3 42:6,16,19,21 43:12,21 45:6,13 46:23 47:23 48:15 49:16 50:6,18 51:15 54:15 55:5 57:16 60:2,20,23 62:14,20 64:10 65:2,5,8,11,16,20 67:12 68:9,14 69:2,16 70:12,22 73:20 74:4,7,16 75:10,12,15 77:12 80:3,6,13 81:8,13 81:20,23 82:6 83:13 86:17 87:7 87:11 89:22 90:15 90:18 92:5 93:8 93:11,16,21 94:4	94:11 95:10,13 96:10 97:14 98:16 100:7 101:12,22 103:6,16 104:4,21 105:4 110:2 112:17 113:10,18 113:21 114:4,8,19 114:22 119:15 125:21 130:3,8 131:7,12,14,16,21 132:4 133:15 136:6,22 137:18 140:10 142:2 145:2 148:17 149:3,15 150:5,22 154:8 155:8 157:16 159:17 160:4,14,21 162:3 162:6 163:2,9,23 166:14 168:23 170:3,23 171:12 172:14 173:7 174:7 175:2,19 176:8 177:5,21 183:22 184:8 185:11,19 186:15 186:20 188:6 189:17 192:8,11 194:3,13 195:13 195:17 196:15,18 197:4,7 199:11,17 199:21 200:14 202:8 203:14,22 204:11,15 207:9 211:18,22 216:16 217:7,13 218:2,13 218:23 219:13 220:8 S s (5) 2:2 21:11,23 104:17 119:9 safety (2) 169:19 196:10 sake (1) 154:14
---	---	--	---	---

sam (1) 212:9	43:18 44:22 57:22	74:6 99:6,13	seeing (21) 3:18	146:7 148:11
samples (2) 216:3,3	67:2 74:23 79:20	103:7 171:18	11:18 19:16 22:22	150:7,8,16,19
san (1) 163:16	81:8 88:17 92:17	sections (3) 14:13	23:5,17,21 47:14	151:13,16,20
sandbox (1) 156:6	95:9 116:16	17:9 53:10	47:18 78:4 98:10	152:2,11,15,17
sandy (8) 55:9,13	129:12 169:17	sediment (48) 1:4	170:20 171:15	153:5,6 154:13,16
74:12 75:5 76:8	172:23 173:8,11	5:20 8:8,10,20	172:12 174:5,17	154:18 155:23
78:16 84:5 93:19	173:21 183:3,19	10:6,7,14,14	174:21 176:5	156:21,22 158:11
satisfactory (1)	183:20,21,22	12:11 27:19 64:3	177:2,15 178:22	159:3 160:5
124:19	184:2 188:10	81:21 104:9	seen (5) 58:9,9,10	162:16 164:7,19
satisfied (1) 85:7	189:12 190:8,19	110:23 111:3	58:13 77:9	165:11 166:8,12
savannah (1)	192:11,17 199:4,9	114:15 126:10	seep (6) 12:8	166:17,17 168:4
177:10	205:17,18,19	131:20,22 149:10	174:22 175:9,11	168:10 179:15,19
saw (8) 67:5 89:14	207:16 208:14	168:9,11,12,19	175:12,20	179:22 180:8,15
89:19 116:12	209:3 214:22	169:2,4,6,23	seepage (1) 121:5	181:4,7,17 182:4
180:8,20 208:14	215:10 216:10	170:12,13,14	selected (6) 67:19	182:6 186:7,9,18
228:15	219:6	174:6,9,13,18	104:16 126:5	187:7,11,12,14,16
saying (75) 9:9	scale (2) 110:19,20	175:14 176:15	139:9 161:6	187:17,19 188:10
29:19 30:18 32:18	scary (1) 208:20	179:11 188:14	167:12	188:20,21,23
34:15 36:5 38:23	scenarios (1)	208:7 220:2	selecting (1) 174:2	189:4,9,20 190:9
45:12 50:18 56:23	156:18	224:15,22 225:17	selection (1) 25:11	190:17 192:13
60:23 65:9 67:16	schematic (1)	226:20 228:16	selfcertifying (1)	197:2,6 214:5,15
69:2 76:21 77:3	190:15	229:17	207:7	215:2 218:21
79:12 84:14 89:18	science (2) 208:21	sedimentation (2)	sell (13) 180:10	219:4 221:11
91:6 92:6,7,10,11	224:6	23:9 215:11	181:20 182:15,17	sent (3) 92:12
97:9 105:7 106:12	scope (1) 208:6	sediments (1) 54:10	185:2,2,3,6	136:3 212:14
112:19,20 113:4	scratch (3) 55:18	see (50) 3:13 11:12	187:16,18 192:18	sentence (1) 42:10
114:2,4 121:9,23	107:16,18	15:20 16:9 19:2,9	192:20 193:11	separate (5) 51:6
128:3,14 129:2,2	sd1 (3) 15:21	20:12,22 24:5	selling (2) 181:2	97:16 117:17
129:3,9 130:6	104:11 168:2	26:6,20 44:20	217:8	122:13 145:18
135:9,13 142:4,8	sd3 (1) 174:13	52:2 53:13 54:14	sells (1) 200:10	separated (3) 29:9
144:10 151:19,21	sd4 (2) 174:6,7	56:8 57:12 76:9	semantic (1) 89:4	29:10,16
153:16 156:10,14	sd4s (1) 12:8	77:12 78:10,13	send (2) 108:16	separately (1)
160:2,4 162:16	se (2) 198:7 205:5	79:20,22 82:17	112:18	83:22
164:13,22 165:9	sealant (2) 209:17	84:2 91:7 95:10	sense (6) 32:16	september (2) 4:9
166:9 175:15	209:19	102:15 103:3	37:7 46:10 115:8	199:16
184:13 192:2	seat (1) 203:19	109:4 111:4,5,6	115:9 189:14	series (3) 21:22
195:3 197:8	second (5) 41:11	119:13 128:6	sensitive (97) 8:9	210:17 211:8
199:22 201:22,23	102:2,13,16	167:11 181:16,23	9:15 12:10 15:19	serious (1) 205:11
202:12 203:10	177:20	182:9 186:9	26:21 27:10 29:2	service (3) 21:13
204:9 205:20	secondguess (1)	190:12 192:8	29:18 104:10	22:2,9
207:15 211:4,18	116:19	197:22 200:23	105:2,8 125:12,17	set (56) 7:13,15,15
226:13 229:3	section (17) 12:17	203:11 205:13	129:9,12,16 130:2	17:19 29:20 40:8
says (49) 13:8	14:18 16:12 17:11	217:16 219:5	130:14,18 131:2	40:15 50:14 53:23
30:16 37:17,21	42:16 46:14,17,18	220:13 229:18	132:7,18 133:17	54:13,16,17 55:6
39:9,20 41:7,13	47:2,12,14,17	seed (1) 30:23	142:22 145:8	64:18 69:7 73:17

90:23 99:23 100:13 105:23 106:2,5,5,9,23 107:2,4 109:7,13 113:10,12,13 119:16,22 120:21 134:9 140:11,13 142:14 152:7 155:14 156:23 158:22,23 159:2,8 159:9,13,19 163:4 163:6,11 166:16 181:14 188:3 196:21 setting (3) 27:9 90:13 119:21 setup (2) 55:11,17 seven (2) 3:12 42:21 sewn (1) 214:19 shalls (5) 30:21 33:13,18 38:3,5 shape (3) 50:3,4 70:21 shaped (2) 201:16 201:16 shapes (1) 54:5 share (1) 133:14 shared (1) 221:5 shear (4) 102:3,4 102:13,15 sheet (8) 7:2 18:19 19:2 26:10 194:9 196:16,19 197:8 shes (1) 6:15 shied (1) 224:13 shipped (1) 158:17 shoes (1) 42:23 shooting (1) 159:5 shop (1) 164:2 short (3) 58:4 173:9 189:13 shorter (1) 205:23 shortterm (3) 40:9 40:12 41:15	shouldnt (5) 27:8 32:13 202:15 206:12 223:22 shoulds (1) 33:13 show (3) 9:5 69:6 89:14 showed (5) 48:9 89:9,19 211:23 212:3 shown (1) 215:11 shows (3) 41:14 77:6 190:15 shrinking (1) 133:5 shut (1) 147:5 side (9) 34:17 120:17 126:14 139:12 144:4 149:20 166:17 182:8 216:4 sight (1) 150:15 signed (2) 179:8 213:23 silent (1) 117:22 silly (2) 59:5 210:12 silt (125) 8:11,20 8:23 9:3,4,23 10:16 49:17 51:4 52:2 57:10 58:5 58:12 59:15 60:6 60:7,10,10,13,15 61:19 64:8 67:13 67:14,16 70:9,20 71:2,5 80:7,14,14 80:18 81:19 82:10 86:15 91:3,12,23 97:11,13,19 99:19 105:18 106:16 108:14,23 110:9 112:11 117:9 125:20 126:2,12 127:12 131:9 132:3 137:23 149:9 152:18 154:6 156:12,22	158:13 162:14 165:5,11 168:2,8 168:11 170:22 171:2,6 179:18 181:20 183:10 185:12 187:14,19 189:5 190:10,16 191:11 195:3,19 196:15,19 197:16 197:18 198:3,5 200:22 201:17 203:21 205:22 206:3,4 209:7,9 214:3 218:20,22 219:9,9,15,17 221:2,9,16 222:3 222:21,22 223:5 224:5,16,20,21 225:5,17 226:20 227:16,18 229:4 229:16,20 230:15 similar (3) 76:12 135:10 220:20 simple (1) 173:15 simpler (1) 13:19 simply (4) 48:4 100:2 196:8 218:10 single (8) 69:9,14 75:7 100:10 155:11 162:11 198:10 210:21 singleton (1) 213:22 sir (5) 139:7 140:4 140:9 213:23 215:16 site (4) 77:9,10 107:5 111:4 sites (6) 6:9 11:16 111:5 159:23 174:15,19 sitting (1) 203:19 six (3) 31:11 155:2 228:7	sixteen (1) 155:14 size (8) 24:12 79:20 79:22 173:18 180:8 181:16 193:6 194:5 sizes (2) 183:13 219:18 sizing (2) 173:5 192:8 skimmer (5) 172:21 173:3,9,10 174:3 skimmers (5) 12:8 172:13,18,20 173:6 skus (1) 147:2 slide (1) 54:6 slides (1) 118:19 slight (1) 15:12 slip (1) 212:17 slope (48) 12:3,5,5 15:23 26:13,16,22 27:5,7,8,18 28:3 28:15,21 29:11 31:14 34:5,7 37:23 39:9,13,18 44:14 45:4,18 46:21 49:6 52:23 53:2,4 54:7 69:17 69:20 76:12 83:18 106:3,4,23 107:3 114:9,10,12 116:6 118:13 172:4 174:21 182:19,23 slopes (4) 32:7 64:15 163:11,19 slow (1) 54:9 slower (1) 188:16 small (7) 18:6 24:16 144:8 154:6 174:10,15 178:13 smaller (7) 55:7 100:19 174:11,19 184:7,8 191:13 snooky (1) 194:15	sock (38) 49:10,18 50:13 51:3 61:19 62:22 64:9 68:10 69:3 71:15 79:16 79:19,20,22 81:18 83:6 86:18 91:15 91:17 94:14,20 95:2,6 96:9,11,17 97:23 98:14 131:13,14 179:12 184:18 189:10 190:4 191:12 195:20 219:19 226:4 socks (30) 54:3 60:19,22 68:22 69:12 70:9 71:20 71:22 72:2,19 73:16 79:6,7 80:12 81:9 82:10 91:4 105:17 106:15 117:11 131:19,22 137:20 158:15 161:5,9 209:7 217:18 220:6 227:17 software (1) 25:17 soil (42) 2:3,5 3:9 21:21 22:2,2,11 22:11,15,20 23:8 48:17 55:8,11,13 74:3,9,21,22 76:4 76:18,22,23 77:2 77:8,12,16,17 78:8,16 84:5 93:19 114:10 116:5 177:8 200:3 200:12 201:14 206:19 207:6,22 227:21 soils (1) 93:18 sold (1) 218:4 somebody (28) 12:4 17:20 28:15 31:3 35:8 42:13
---	---	--	---	---

45:15 50:3 60:6 61:8 68:4 71:4,7 76:4 77:4,19 78:13 97:14 120:23 122:3 153:21 154:17 155:11 172:2 177:12 187:20 216:17 220:14 somebodys (1) 63:8 someones (1) 90:11 someplace (1) 44:15 somewhat (3) 105:4 108:9 128:7 soon (2) 67:6 201:15 sooner (1) 166:17 sorry (9) 15:22 27:15 30:14 46:22 99:17 145:10 165:11 210:12 215:8 sort (10) 82:23 85:14 109:6 110:22 126:9 128:14,17 161:17 221:7 226:14 sound (3) 123:17 192:5 228:14 sounds (8) 33:12 38:10 85:7 93:2 109:23 161:14 193:23 222:17 source (1) 35:3 sources (1) 19:18 southeast (1) 158:18 southwest (1) 66:16 spacing (12) 28:18 32:12,19 33:13 38:12 76:12 180:9 181:15 184:5 188:10,11 192:19 spacings (1) 193:18	speak (9) 9:10 43:6 51:5 90:2 125:11 133:8 147:9 203:8 220:15 speakers (1) 2:17 speaking (2) 189:7 191:17 spec (4) 215:6,9 222:16 226:14 specific (9) 17:16 17:19 26:8 39:16 43:22 45:6 54:16 185:22 221:19 specifically (7) 30:17 39:15,21 62:17 83:3 225:19 226:2 specification (14) 39:11 49:11 69:16 72:5 76:11 92:20 101:15 183:23 194:5,10 195:19 199:22 200:18 218:23 specifications (18) 30:21 32:12 44:5 44:17,18 60:8 92:16 102:11,21 103:2 185:14 188:4 191:6 196:3 223:18 227:11,17 229:19 specifics (1) 218:10 specified (12) 32:20 35:9 38:17 65:6 70:14 74:9 93:12 100:8 107:9 163:2 172:16 207:10 specifies (1) 199:17 specify (8) 35:13 37:3 48:23 49:2,5 93:8 137:8 174:8 specifying (4) 63:8 102:15 174:4 218:13	specs (8) 53:4 71:19 131:21 180:8 196:7 214:22 224:3 226:16 spectrum (2) 34:18 149:12 spelling (1) 20:22 spells (1) 37:14 spend (5) 21:4 117:6 167:13,14 167:14 split (2) 26:20 172:6 spot (1) 60:9 spots (1) 156:2 sprague (10) 4:7 50:11 52:5 68:5 85:4 121:13 213:18,19 218:7 225:18 spread (1) 39:17 spreading (2) 209:9 209:11 square (2) 118:5 222:3 ss (1) 16:2 stab (1) 7:16 stabilization (35) 12:3,6 16:2 26:13 26:17,22 27:18 28:3,21 29:11 31:14 34:6,7 38:2 39:10,14,18 44:14 45:5,18 46:21 67:4 76:13 99:6 101:17,19 102:8 103:3,7,21 104:8 114:12 174:21 175:23 176:3 stabilize (1) 12:5 stack (1) 116:13 stage (1) 155:10 stake (3) 73:18 183:13 223:11	stakeholders (1) 35:10 stakes (11) 72:4,4 89:20,21,22 131:15,16,23 182:18 183:14 185:8 staking (1) 89:8 stance (1) 91:15 stand (2) 3:18 231:11 standalone (3) 47:9 171:5,8 standard (41) 8:7 37:10 44:13 54:16 64:9 73:5 75:9 76:15 77:4,6 78:21 83:11 109:6 113:12,13 119:21 126:9 128:13,17 128:18 129:20 130:7 142:14 143:6 144:5,7,8 144:11 146:6,12 147:17 148:15 152:7,10,14,18 153:6 154:19 155:18 159:3 166:6 standardization (...) 110:22 standardized (1) 53:15 standards (11) 16:4 65:15 69:8 105:2 113:11 119:16 140:11,14 141:7 145:21 170:9 standpoint (6) 12:20 28:3 47:14 71:17 221:15 222:14 stands (3) 22:10 23:13 208:22 stapled (1) 7:2	stapling (1) 44:22 start (13) 6:22,22 10:21 11:11 77:21 108:18 121:17 143:18 147:8 156:3 202:20 212:4 229:21 started (4) 6:23 78:14 121:5 175:4 starting (2) 41:6 47:2 starts (2) 41:11 99:7 state (35) 4:18 6:14 16:21 19:20 22:6 54:2,12 57:21 58:3 75:3 106:7 108:2,10,13,15 109:9,12 113:13 134:23 141:7,11 156:3 161:18 163:16 176:18,22 201:17,19 204:23 205:3,5,8,20 206:22 221:17 stated (1) 232:11 statement (5) 39:9 46:13 85:5 209:18 217:6 states (17) 48:3 108:5,6,8 109:6 115:13 117:8 124:17 158:18 175:9 208:6 221:16 222:6,7,22 223:18 224:10 statewide (1) 205:13 stating (2) 72:6 77:19 statistic (3) 128:14 129:18 133:3 statistical (10) 132:21 135:22 143:6,9,14,22
---	--	--	--	--

144:22 145:7 164:14 178:7 statistically (2) 135:11 144:12 statistics (2) 133:6 148:15 stay (8) 29:12 41:12 47:7 61:21 83:7 95:6 153:2 223:11 stays (1) 98:4 steep (2) 54:7 55:7 step (2) 88:3 91:20 stepping (1) 214:2 stick (1) 230:21 sticking (1) 14:10 stinks (1) 156:3 stitch (3) 28:18 32:12,19 stitching (2) 33:13 97:17 stone (10) 60:8 61:2 66:10,14,16 66:18 71:21 72:18 72:20 198:19 stop (3) 121:6 176:13 202:18 stopping (2) 69:14 203:9 storage (4) 174:9 174:13,19 175:14 stormwater (1) 17:10 story (1) 196:20 straight (4) 10:13 10:14 70:21 179:7 straightened (1) 94:21 strands (1) 220:12 strange (2) 70:10 228:14 straw (40) 7:20,21 8:18 9:14 27:5,7 29:21,22 30:17 32:4 40:10,17,22	41:6,12,14,17 48:2,7 49:19 61:2 61:13 63:4 68:18 68:19,21 69:7,10 71:21 72:19,22 100:21 110:5 130:4,5,11,13 145:3,5 172:3 stream (1) 176:12 streams (1) 149:16 strength (7) 194:17 195:8,19 219:8 220:23 223:5 229:5 strengths (1) 195:6 stress (4) 102:3,4 102:13,15 stringent (5) 102:5 141:8 177:11 200:15,17 structural (3) 46:13,15 92:19 structure (1) 53:13 structures (1) 66:10 struggled (2) 219:16,22 studies (5) 70:23 102:8 175:3,5,8 study (2) 182:19,23 stuff (44) 25:13 28:10,14 29:13 49:19 54:9 60:16 62:15 69:4 70:4,6 77:15 78:3 92:8 92:12 93:13 94:21 95:4 102:23 134:7 137:21,22 138:5 142:7 149:17,18 150:12 154:23 173:17,18 176:2 176:15,20 177:8 184:19 203:15 210:19 213:13 216:18 217:8,17	218:15 223:11 231:5 style (2) 187:14,19 styrofoam (3) 138:4 228:16,20 submit (5) 113:3 134:11 138:10 223:2 228:5 submits (1) 225:20 submittal (1) 225:21 submitted (5) 136:8 137:3,4 138:13 206:18 substantially (2) 122:13,23 sucking (1) 173:17 suffice (1) 166:3 suggest (4) 10:20 31:9 36:4 88:15 suggested (1) 202:6 suggestion (5) 10:18 21:2 38:10 53:9 127:21 suit (1) 79:20 suitable (1) 189:10 summary (4) 5:6 7:2,4 26:7 supplier (1) 51:22 supplies (1) 182:16 support (7) 33:20 33:23 88:2 143:15 181:4 187:17 191:4 suppose (1) 118:2 supposed (5) 30:20 67:3 173:21 193:19 194:10 sure (27) 11:3,10 19:8,12 34:23 35:5 39:5 52:19 53:3 64:18 75:19 76:7 87:15 97:11 99:15 106:12 109:10 121:18	144:17 158:6 173:21 191:16 214:18 221:10 224:11 228:21 230:12 surface (2) 172:13 173:16 surfaces (1) 169:19 surprised (1) 224:23 survived (1) 82:15 swales (1) 53:11 swells (1) 209:17 symbols (7) 12:21 12:23 13:4 14:4 14:11 15:16 16:7 system (6) 11:14 17:13 106:17 128:2 180:17 192:4 systems (4) 179:9 185:2 193:12 207:17 T t (2) 232:3,3 tab (1) 21:10 table (7) 25:8 40:7 40:8,14 41:3,19 173:5 tac (240) 1:1,3 2:1 3:1 4:1,11,12,18 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1	45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1,21 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1,18 117:1 118:1,4 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1 153:1 154:1 155:1 156:1 157:1 158:1 158:23 159:1 160:1 161:1 162:1 163:1 164:1 165:1 166:1 167:1 168:1 169:1 170:1 171:1 172:1 173:1 174:1
---	---	--	--	---

175:1 176:1 177:1 178:1 179:1 180:1 181:1 182:1 183:1 184:1 185:1 186:1 187:1 188:1 189:1 190:1 191:1 192:1 193:1 194:1 195:1 196:1 197:1 198:1 199:1 200:1 201:1 202:1 203:1 204:1 205:1 206:1 207:1 208:1 209:1 210:1 211:1 212:1 213:1 214:1 215:1 216:1 217:1 218:1 219:1 220:1 221:1 222:1 223:1,21 224:1 225:1 226:1 227:1 228:1 229:1 230:1 231:1 tack (1) 172:3 tackified (4) 27:5,7 29:21,22 tackifier (2) 171:23 172:8 tackifiers (3) 47:10 47:16,18 tags (1) 6:16 take (35) 4:16 7:16 10:20 17:18 21:6 40:8,14 41:19 47:5 49:3 51:3 63:6 72:23 75:22 76:18 77:14 88:18 90:12 92:22 99:14 107:18 118:8 127:22 128:16 132:13 133:16 139:16 156:22 168:14 178:11 193:16 198:7 210:11 216:3 228:10 takeaway (2) 117:12 204:6	taken (8) 4:15 35:3 100:17 169:20 175:22 194:23 202:6,16 takes (8) 4:23 59:10 66:13 100:13 142:2,5 171:2 220:14 talk (11) 59:9 105:10 111:9 113:7 116:12 118:14 119:17 168:21 194:16 198:14 206:16 talked (18) 9:17 15:19 30:7 43:23 72:9 110:3,14 128:15,18 133:10 150:23 154:13 170:17 195:18 198:16 209:2 216:16 219:14 talking (40) 10:16 14:6 35:8 37:5 39:15 40:6 51:13 52:22 54:21 67:9 67:10,18,20 71:9 80:12 86:2 87:3 87:13 92:23 96:3 96:6 97:3 108:14 109:20 134:19 141:4 143:19 144:18 145:16 153:14 161:10 162:5 169:4 184:20,21 186:4 187:22 188:2 197:7 218:14 tall (2) 69:21,22 taller (1) 205:23 tapc (1) 175:4 tape (8) 194:19,19 194:22,23,23 196:13,13 198:9 target (1) 145:11	taxpayer (2) 213:9 213:10 tech (2) 25:16 102:9 technical (7) 1:3 2:8 3:6,21 5:14 7:7 205:18 technically (2) 41:8 68:10 techniques (1) 175:6 tell (10) 15:18 62:8 155:13 181:22 182:20 185:22 200:8 203:15 211:2,14 telling (4) 84:11 172:20,21 219:17 tells (2) 201:14 208:9 temporary (2) 66:11 174:6 ten (7) 71:10 102:22,22 103:10 155:2 157:4 191:18 tend (2) 36:21 154:8 tenminute (1) 168:14 tennessee (1) 174:17 tensile (4) 220:22 221:21 228:2 229:4 term (5) 12:6 37:4 41:10,17 83:3 terminal (1) 31:17 terminology (5) 23:20 24:18 25:3 25:21 97:5 terms (13) 23:18 36:12,13,18 50:9 50:12 51:6 188:12 191:23 215:23	220:11 221:20 229:14 test (243) 9:5 28:4 36:11 46:4 48:13 49:15 50:23 52:4 53:23 54:3,6,15 54:18 55:16,20 56:21 57:7 58:11 58:20 59:16 61:15 64:3 66:3 67:5,20 68:4,17 71:5 73:22 76:6 77:8 77:13 78:12 79:3 79:22,23 84:3 85:3,7,19 86:14 86:16,23 87:12,12 90:9 91:13 94:12 96:11 100:8,10,11 101:3 102:6,17,20 104:19 105:6,10 105:14,18,22 106:4,16,17,20,21 107:5,13,16 108:7 108:7,10,19 109:4 109:4,5,10,16,17 109:20,21 110:4,6 110:9,10,11,13,23 111:6,13,15,19 112:4,5,7,9,11,15 112:22 114:2,6 115:14,17,18 116:18,21 117:10 117:16 118:9 119:5,7,12 120:10 120:23 121:4,6,7 121:10,14,18,19 123:4,6,6,10 125:3,7,9,14,21 125:22,23 127:13 134:5 136:3 139:6 140:6 141:4,12 142:3,3,4,13 144:10 145:12 148:2,18,22 151:15 153:15	162:8 163:12,16 163:16,17,18,21 163:22 164:5 165:3,9,22 166:21 166:21 173:20 180:13 182:5,8 184:3,12,16 185:15,18,19 186:11,20 191:23 195:2,6,11,16,20 196:8 197:2,3,18 197:22 198:6,11 198:20 199:4,14 201:11,15 202:20 203:2,9,13,21 204:8 205:15 206:3,4,10,14 207:9,11 208:9,13 208:15,18 209:2,8 209:21,23 210:8 210:10,11,15,16 210:21 211:9,11 211:12 212:8,10 212:12,15,19 215:23 216:5,7 217:14 220:6 221:2,3,3,9,22,22 222:15 227:22 tested (122) 7:18,22 9:14 36:10 43:11 45:19,21 49:10 51:23 54:4 56:20 57:6 61:22 70:5,6 73:3 77:6,18 78:7 78:11 91:2 108:14 108:16 112:6 113:7 117:7 128:21 129:4 130:13,16 132:15 134:9,16 135:6,15 135:19 136:15 139:2,10,19,20 140:21 142:11,12 142:21 144:13 146:14,17 147:15
--	---	---	--	---

147:19,21 148:7,8 148:12 151:19,23 152:2,9,16,21 153:2 160:17,20 162:10,17 164:2 164:15,17 166:10 166:11,15 167:5,9 167:9 168:3,6 169:11 179:14,23 180:7,13,20 181:9 181:11,15,17,19 182:7,10 183:2,10 183:11,18 185:10 186:14,22 187:3,5 187:16,23 188:11 188:23 189:15 191:3,5,7,14,20 192:16 193:21 201:10 205:6 206:8 210:4,5,12 211:9 212:7 214:5 217:17 224:7 227:20 tester (1) 106:5 testing (104) 4:14 5:9 28:9 36:16,16 43:16,19,20,22 46:3,3 48:9 50:5 51:7,11 53:15,16 54:2,11,13,17 55:9,23 56:4,11 56:15 61:3 63:20 64:17,20 69:5,5 70:3 73:21 83:8 95:20 101:11 104:16 106:2,19 108:2 109:14,15 113:15 117:13 118:14 121:2,9 125:8 128:3 131:3 139:3 141:17 142:7 148:5 152:16 153:19 159:12 160:7,21 161:9,21 162:4,23	163:7 164:6,16 165:20 167:12 178:17,17,19 179:2,2 184:21 186:14 187:14 192:7 193:12 202:11,12,17 204:19 205:8,16 205:17,19 206:9 207:4 208:3,6,8,8 210:6,7,13,17 212:21 213:20 220:5 221:6 222:2 225:19,21 tests (28) 31:18 51:16 58:9 74:10 76:20 85:20 87:4 87:6 92:4 105:19 105:21,23 108:17 113:11 120:20 121:11,15,16,21 128:4 141:2,3,15 141:20 145:19 157:2 163:5 210:17 texas (1) 163:15 thank (9) 3:7 22:16 45:3 98:9 118:13 146:9 194:2 215:18 231:8 thanks (1) 37:22 thats (237) 5:6 7:9 8:20,22 9:7 15:8 16:13 17:18,21 19:21 20:10 25:5 25:8,23 27:16,22 31:7,19 32:3 36:2 36:5 38:9 39:4,13 40:2 41:18 42:15 44:9 45:20 46:3,9 47:17 48:20 49:23 50:2,6 54:15,16 54:20 55:18 56:4 59:21,22,23 60:9 61:7,9 63:17	64:10,11 67:11 68:2,12 69:21,22 72:21,23 76:17 77:10 78:8,11 79:12,13,14 80:6 81:20 82:12,13 83:2,21 84:4,10 84:22 85:12 86:10 87:6,13,15,22 89:8,9 90:21 91:6 91:18,19 93:4,21 94:12 95:21 96:6 96:8,15,15 98:16 100:10,13 101:10 106:8,13 108:8 109:3,15,18 110:7 110:12 112:7 113:15,16,23 115:2,3,13,23 116:21 119:8 120:6 121:15 124:8,22 127:5,14 127:20 132:8 134:13 135:2 136:21 137:4,10 139:3,21 140:8 142:17,20,23 143:16 144:6 145:14,15,18 147:10,15 148:3 149:4,5,14 150:3 150:7 152:23 153:17 154:3,5,20 154:21 155:15 156:9 158:20 162:20 163:2,4 164:18 165:14 166:12 167:9 168:19 170:16 171:14 172:4,5,6 173:5,22 174:10 174:20 178:13 179:16 181:9,10 182:7,15,23 184:8 184:13 185:9	186:19 187:15 188:4 189:11,18 189:23 190:5,7,14 191:8,20,20 192:15 194:21 195:11,23 196:20 196:21 197:20 198:11,11 200:8 203:11,19 205:11 206:15 207:16 208:16,20,21,22 210:12,22 211:3 212:11 213:3,16 213:17,23 217:8 217:19 219:16,21 220:2 221:11,23 222:11 223:15 225:14 227:8 228:3,7 229:17 231:6 theirs (1) 194:7 theory (1) 78:6 thered (1) 55:19 therell (1) 159:2 theres (85) 9:19 10:23 11:6,7 15:12 23:10 26:18 26:21 37:6 40:5 47:3 48:21 49:5,9 49:16 54:5 57:10 59:20 60:8,9,19 62:10 65:16,23 66:15 67:14 68:2 68:15 69:2 71:3 71:15 79:8 82:11 84:4,22 85:13 86:8 87:8,22 89:7 89:8 92:7 96:7,19 97:20 98:12 99:10 116:22 119:13,16 129:13 135:7 139:4 141:19 147:2 149:9 153:10,10,11 154:9,11,17	156:18 157:3 163:11 167:6,18 170:5 173:5,17,22 177:20 182:22 196:7,21 202:13 202:13 203:10 211:5 214:8 218:12,19 223:10 223:13 228:21 theyll (9) 48:6 71:6 78:3 152:16 159:12 202:3 217:4 222:9,21 theyre (36) 30:16 61:21 66:22 67:3 69:18 72:3 74:7 74:16 75:10 84:12 89:13 95:23,23 96:2 97:5,18 111:2 124:16 125:16 141:14 154:21 157:5 159:5 160:3,3,4 174:3 184:11 185:13,23 189:3 193:19 196:19 207:19 208:22 218:9 theyve (7) 74:8 77:20 158:16,16 165:21 167:12 226:4 thick (1) 132:5 thing (64) 6:13 8:15 10:12 14:22 23:3 32:3,23 45:20 50:2 58:18 59:12 61:17 63:6 69:6,7 74:14 80:14,18,21 83:22 93:2 104:4 108:15 119:15 120:7 124:3 126:19,23 127:9 128:12 130:4 134:2
---	--	--	---	--

139:13 145:17 170:5 172:17 184:8 186:13 191:8 194:3,16,18 197:16 198:14 202:5 205:4,8,11 205:21 206:5 208:20 212:23 213:3,5,15 217:20 218:5,5,14 219:5 219:12 220:10 222:9 231:4 things (41) 7:18 8:5 10:3 16:22 19:22 22:3 31:5 32:7 48:22 56:10 58:11 71:9,11 79:11 88:6 97:2 134:15 135:10 136:4 137:19 139:20 145:15 150:2 151:2,5 161:20 172:5 173:19 175:19 182:22 194:21 195:5 196:22 211:22 218:18 220:6,19 226:6,12 227:9 229:13 think (267) 9:23 10:5,7,9,12 13:4 14:2,21 15:4,6,7 15:11 16:3,7 18:16 20:14 25:14 28:23 29:4,20 31:22 33:20 34:17 35:4 36:5,15,16 36:17 39:4,23 41:8 42:22 43:5 43:13,20 45:14,20 46:6,9 47:3 48:9 50:6,11 51:4,6,8,9 52:7,10,13,15,17 53:5,7,14,20,23 54:3,10 55:14,18	56:18 57:9 58:2 58:17 59:7,8 60:6 62:10,20,22 63:15 65:20,22 68:5 69:11 71:17 75:18 75:19 76:16 77:15 77:16 78:5,6 80:9 81:15 82:19 86:8 86:11,17,20 87:16 88:12 89:14 90:10 91:22 92:14 95:8 95:21,22 96:4,21 96:22 97:8 99:8 99:18 101:19 103:4,22 105:14 105:15,16,20 106:2,17 107:16 107:21,22 109:5 110:2,5,7,10,23 111:2,11,20 115:11 116:10,22 117:4,12,14,16,21 117:22,22 118:21 118:22 119:2,8,10 120:17,18 121:8 122:3,4,5,15 123:8,15,18 124:8 124:21 125:2,6,14 125:16,17,19 127:19 128:18 129:14,14,16,18 129:22,22 130:10 132:14 133:6,9,13 133:15 134:3,14 134:19 135:10 136:18,19 138:19 139:17 140:8 141:19,20 144:6 144:11,14 145:18 145:18 147:10,11 147:14,16 149:6 151:21 154:3,3 157:12,22 158:8 161:3 162:9,20 163:20 164:12	167:4,7 172:12 175:7 179:4 181:18 183:8 184:10 187:5,10 187:22 188:8,17 189:11 190:6,14 190:23 191:22 196:5 197:13 199:15 200:16,20 201:4,8 203:6,17 204:16 205:10,11 210:3 211:22 213:3,4 216:20,22 217:20 219:10 220:10,17 221:12 222:7,10,12 223:4 223:6,14,23 224:11,20 225:5 225:14 226:11,12 226:12,13,15 228:9,22 230:9 231:6 thinking (6) 71:12 87:17 120:6 148:17 217:21 229:14 third (5) 114:16 132:16 163:3 191:19 207:10 thirdparty (6) 4:13 56:10,14 91:20 178:23 179:3 thomas (7) 2:9,14 43:14 53:9 81:11 81:17,21 thoroughly (1) 179:5 thought (26) 7:8,11 7:20 34:9,16,19 35:16 43:23 44:10 51:16 63:14 68:20 81:17 99:17 100:18 110:20 113:2,23 122:8 142:20 154:4	173:12 195:8,10 204:11 206:15 thoughts (3) 203:3 206:9,10 thousand (1) 107:4 threat (1) 169:14 three (56) 48:18 71:9 87:5,7,10 105:19,21 109:21 112:16,18 113:3,4 113:8,14,16,19 123:6,10,22 124:22 132:20,23 133:18 135:3 138:22 147:20 148:9,14 152:22 152:23 158:11,12 158:20 159:15 160:6 162:16 164:20,21 165:17 165:19 166:2,18 168:6 179:17,19 179:22 181:12 185:6 189:8,10 193:2,3,4,7 220:12 222:22 threetoone (1) 27:8 threeyear (23) 44:2 132:16 133:2 134:10 147:20,23 148:6,6 154:14 158:3,4,8 162:18 164:4,4,23 168:3 185:14 186:12,16 186:17 206:18 216:10 threshold (3) 27:4 30:3 145:13 thresholds (1) 224:17 throw (2) 120:17 149:2 throwing (2) 32:20 129:9 thrown (1) 84:5	tied (2) 92:16 225:23 tight (1) 156:2 time (63) 3:17 4:6 4:12 6:15 20:7 21:4 22:7 34:6,7 35:11 47:6 50:14 51:9 55:11 56:20 58:17,22 73:10 75:6 90:9 107:10 107:21 113:3 118:8 120:3 122:8 123:14,14,15 124:12,16 126:6 130:4,4 132:10,16 132:18 134:12 137:3 146:13,19 148:8 155:21 157:13,14,16 165:17,18,20,22 170:4 178:8 185:20 195:4 196:9 198:6 207:5 213:17 215:21 216:18 218:3 226:7 231:11 times (8) 54:14 72:15 87:10 123:20,22 185:22 195:18 204:4 timing (2) 161:4,20 tires (1) 40:18 today (32) 3:5,6 4:2 4:21 5:2,4,10,14 7:12 22:8 146:16 149:14 153:13,13 153:22,23 155:4 170:7,18 178:18 182:2 184:21,22 186:4 189:11 191:17 192:6 195:11 197:14 208:11 217:8 220:20 today's (3) 3:10
---	---	---	---	--

4:23 6:10 told (3) 114:6 181:23 202:18 tomorrow (1) 166:15 tools (3) 21:13,14 21:14 top (10) 27:21 37:11 69:19 73:17 92:16 172:16,23 173:17 189:15 214:9 topic (1) 6:11 totally (4) 97:15,19 114:6 200:13 touched (1) 194:15 tougher (1) 35:23 town (1) 53:22 toxicity (4) 33:18 34:3 42:6 228:21 track (1) 218:11 traditional (15) 8:11,23 44:13 74:18 93:22 120:4 154:12 160:5 170:16 174:13 176:18 180:16 185:12 200:18 218:3 traditionally (3) 28:11 55:9 74:10 traffic (2) 196:12 196:12 trail (1) 175:21 transcribed (1) 3:23 transcript (2) 3:23 232:15 transferred (1) 104:5 transition (1) 140:15 trap (5) 169:4,8 170:12,14 174:6 traps (4) 168:19	169:2,23 170:13 tree (4) 12:9 177:3 177:9,11 trees (2) 103:14 177:7 tremendous (1) 230:13 tri (29) 4:7 5:8 45:23 46:2 52:13 52:23 73:23 79:23 84:14,20 86:13 89:17 91:13,23 93:2 94:6 106:16 109:10 118:3 139:3 142:11 163:6,18 202:12 206:23 207:4 208:5 212:9,20 trial (1) 97:4 tried (1) 188:12 tris (1) 52:14 trouble (3) 103:18 119:3 181:2 true (3) 27:22 220:8 232:14 truly (2) 101:4 208:21 try (8) 34:20 43:6 66:21 89:7 134:5 147:13 161:16 205:4 trying (16) 29:12 34:20 49:11 70:19 89:11 96:14 110:11 115:18 122:18 125:7 149:3 172:3 204:16 209:3,15 210:23 tuesday (1) 1:7 turbidity (3) 12:8 176:6,8 turn (2) 125:10 155:11 turned (2) 24:14	224:8 turning (1) 171:16 tweak (1) 197:21 tweaks (1) 8:21 twice (3) 69:22 72:14 211:19 two (67) 17:9 26:20 27:12,14 39:9,12 39:20,21 47:8,15 49:18 56:5,8,8,9 58:3 59:4 61:5,14 68:18 70:5 75:16 83:4 87:4 90:16 90:19 92:17 94:16 97:3 104:23 117:17 122:22 128:8 129:3,15,23 130:15 131:17,23 132:3 134:15,18 157:15,16,18 159:9 160:2,12 164:17 165:5,10 166:10 169:10 172:9 175:6 181:10 182:22 185:7 206:14 211:8 213:10 214:5 220:12 222:22 223:12 229:16,17 twothirds (1) 123:7 twoyear (1) 175:12 type (134) 8:6,11 8:23 39:19 41:3,4 43:16 44:3 55:8 56:6 60:13,15 74:3,9,21 76:18 77:2,8,17 81:18 112:7 132:3 133:16 149:8 153:12,13 154:10 154:12,16 156:11 156:21,21 157:9 158:10 160:5 162:15 164:18,20	165:11 166:12,14 168:7 179:12,12 179:12,18,21 180:6,11,13,17,19 181:3,12,13,18 182:9,21 185:4,12 186:6,8,14,18,19 186:21 187:5,5,10 187:18 188:2,15 188:15,18 189:3,4 189:4,14,18 190:9 190:17,22 191:2,3 191:10,12,19 193:5,6,10,12,17 193:18 194:21 196:10 200:22 201:2 205:21,22 206:3,4,5,7,8,8,10 206:11 207:3 209:20 210:23 211:8 212:16,17 212:17 214:4,6,7 214:10,14,15,17 214:18,20,23 215:3,15 217:9,9 226:4,19 230:9,10 230:15,18 types (16) 8:3,3 39:3,9 45:12 67:12 74:10 76:22 76:23 77:16 128:8 218:3 224:14,18 229:16,17 typical (4) 42:9 64:15 133:16 199:2 typically (5) 73:4 191:16 202:13,17 209:6 typo (1) 20:12 U u (2) 21:11,23 uga (1) 142:3 uhhuh (1) 224:4	ultimate (1) 8:14 ultimately (3) 141:5 147:16 149:22 undergone (1) 113:5 understand (32) 10:9,13 35:11 40:6 64:14 70:8 106:12 114:17 123:16 126:3,13 126:15 139:15 154:2 161:8 182:12 187:21 190:12 192:16 194:20 200:2 201:22 202:2,7 203:4,6 205:16 206:21 208:15 210:9 219:13 229:12 understanding (8) 35:7 45:23 115:4 115:19 128:9 203:12 216:8 229:10 understands (1) 126:2 understood (1) 144:18 uneasy (1) 166:4 unfair (2) 53:21 167:8 unfairness (1) 167:6 unfortunately (4) 161:7,14 162:2 217:22 unintentionally (1) 46:17 unit (1) 150:11 united (1) 117:8 units (1) 149:18 universal (3) 22:11 22:15,20
---	--	--	--	---

university (4) 163:15,16,20 207:17	176:11,16,19,22 177:13,13 185:13 186:6,18 193:5,7 193:15 194:23 197:2,6 199:2 221:9 224:21	versa (1) 51:3 version (8) 5:19 6:20 42:12 48:11 73:4 118:11,12 208:12	101:20 108:12 109:9,13 112:5 115:22 116:9,10 116:11 127:19 132:13 137:5 142:13,23 143:3 144:3 145:17 147:2,14 148:16 148:21 150:9 153:16 156:17 164:12 168:21 172:2 176:16 180:22,23 181:13 181:19,21 182:14 182:16 183:16 185:5 186:5,13 188:13 191:15 192:15 194:3,16 194:17,20 197:17 197:19,19,23 198:2,8 205:13 210:21 214:17 221:8,15 222:10 223:11 224:5 227:22	wasnt (16) 9:11 49:10 50:4,19 81:13 88:17 92:16 95:11 99:15 100:7 121:7 124:4 178:2 196:3 202:4,10
unknown (1) 107:19	221:9 224:21	versus (4) 127:9 157:14 206:14 222:16	147:2,14 148:16 148:21 150:9 153:16 156:17 164:12 168:21 172:2 176:16 180:22,23 181:13 181:19,21 182:14 182:16 183:16 185:5 186:5,13 188:13 191:15 192:15 194:3,16 194:17,20 197:17 197:19,19,23 198:2,8 205:13 210:21 214:17 221:8,15 222:10 223:11 224:5 227:22	water (28) 2:3,5 3:9 54:8 106:23 107:2 123:19 131:9 169:6 176:12,18 177:8 188:16 194:17 196:11,13 197:19,21 198:7 200:3,12 201:14 206:20 207:6,22 213:3 227:21 228:17
unpaved (1) 169:3	uses (1) 187:17	vice (1) 51:2	192:15 194:3,16 194:17,20 197:17 197:19,19,23 198:2,8 205:13 210:21 214:17 221:8,15 222:10 223:11 224:5 227:22	waters (1) 176:22
unquantified (1) 62:13	utilized (1) 175:21	victim (1) 161:23	227:22	watkinsville (3) 1:11 3:3,4
unquote (1) 224:9	uv (1) 223:10	video (3) 88:19 116:12 210:18	wanted (20) 9:16 12:5 53:3 63:14 80:4 93:17 99:20 101:13 110:19 143:5 144:17 150:14 174:18 179:10 187:20 197:20 198:14,18 213:19 215:17	watson (72) 2:10 13:7,9 18:8,16 19:13,23 20:4 33:10 40:21 41:5 41:22 42:3 43:23 44:12 45:3 58:16 58:22 76:3 77:3 77:19 79:5,10,16 82:21 84:19 86:21 87:3,12 91:22 95:8,9,18 96:8,13 120:8 121:20 124:21 126:7,14 127:6,16,21 129:11 130:10,19 133:6 135:9,17,21 142:17 143:3,7,12 143:16 144:2,19 144:23 145:4,14 146:3 147:12 166:9 167:3,15 183:20 187:2 188:2 226:21 228:12 229:6,13
unusually (1) 103:13	V	videos (3) 116:13 182:23 213:11	wanting (5) 22:14 74:17 132:11 174:12 191:8	way (106) 8:14,19
update (1) 24:4	v (1) 201:16	virginia (5) 108:9 108:11,13 221:19 222:19	wants (11) 6:22 17:7 49:20 68:4 94:22 102:16 106:10 113:13 154:17 180:21 201:11	
updated (10) 11:19 17:11 19:21 20:21 21:11,22 23:11,19 25:12 26:6	valid (1) 197:13	vote (5) 139:11 140:2 164:9 166:19 167:20	wash (1) 67:7	
validated (1) 69:5	value (6) 30:7 75:13 127:10,22 128:8 132:12	voted (1) 168:7		
upgrade (1) 133:11	variability (3) 9:18 100:14 217:22	vtm (1) 108:12		
upper (2) 144:10 144:11	variables (2) 126:4 127:14	W		
upset (1) 230:2	variances (2) 176:14,21	w (11) 49:17 67:14 70:21,22 86:15 94:13,21 95:2 98:5 200:22 201:16		
urban (1) 2:5	variety (1) 32:6	wait (3) 142:17 146:14,18		
usage (3) 24:19 25:6,23	various (3) 10:4 19:20 36:6	walk (1) 184:23		
use (81) 3:5 9:3 10:13 12:5 14:10 14:22 23:9 24:15 24:17 25:3,21 28:15 32:6 35:19 35:20 39:22 40:7 41:18,19 48:16 57:22,23 58:7 67:20 69:7 73:2,4 76:19,19 78:15 80:5 82:15 91:8 93:18,19 101:8,13 102:16 104:18 108:6,8 109:13 110:23 111:19,20 111:22 114:10,10 116:23,23 120:22 121:22,22 123:11 134:5 140:10,13 140:15 147:14 150:9 171:4 172:21 173:4	vegetation (1) 30:23	walking (1) 175:21		
	vegetative (4) 46:13,15 103:8,10	want (103) 6:17 7:16 8:18 11:5,6,7 11:17 12:21 22:3 23:4,12 29:6 33:4 34:9 35:21 42:23 47:13 49:23 57:13 61:3,5 63:5 68:15 70:15 71:7 74:17 82:3 85:2,22 91:14 92:5 93:8 93:12,18,19,22 94:2,5,6,7,8 101:8		
	vehicle (1) 80:16			
	velocity (8) 24:21 31:17 54:8 62:13 62:17 64:2 70:15 103:9			
	vendor (4) 153:12 159:4 160:18 162:17			
	vendors (3) 164:5 165:2 167:8			
	verbiage (2) 99:11 99:11			
	verify (2) 117:10 132:17			

9:2,7,21 14:8 30:11 31:22 32:15 33:2,14,15 34:10 41:19 43:10 45:15 45:18,21 46:17 47:3 50:2 51:20 55:5 56:8,21 57:21 59:3 61:8 62:14 69:17 71:4 71:18 77:5 79:14 85:21 90:15,18,19 93:17,23 94:23 96:14 97:15 100:13 110:12 111:14 113:16 116:22 117:3,11 119:5 120:8 122:2 123:16,22 126:8 127:17 129:15 131:3 134:4,8 144:9 149:11 153:14 156:8,13 157:7,10 161:7,10 167:7,18 170:12 173:3,4,14 181:9 182:7,11 183:11 183:18,18,20,21 184:4,15,16,16 185:9 186:14 187:15,19 188:3 191:20 192:17 197:18 201:12,21 202:14 203:10 204:16,17 205:8 212:22 220:19 224:5 ways (9) 71:2,3 92:9 129:13 149:15,19 174:12 181:11 210:14 weak (1) 194:20 website (6) 4:2,4 5:11,15 23:12 28:10 wed (11) 3:2 24:4	57:13 58:6 68:3 75:22 111:6 130:12,15 206:23 213:14 week (2) 35:15 225:6 weeks (4) 155:14 155:20 223:12 231:10 weight (1) 182:6 welcome (3) 3:3 167:23 173:4 went (12) 4:5 29:23 31:17,20 54:20 74:18 102:6 177:10 195:5,23 201:18 213:4 wes (1) 10:11 wets (1) 64:15 wetted (1) 49:6 weve (34) 5:13 10:11 56:5,15 58:6 62:18 63:15 69:6 82:16 91:9 93:6 96:17 103:4 111:12 117:8 124:15 125:6 138:22,23 141:21 143:8 152:7,8 158:3 170:17 174:22 177:17 179:4 184:22 186:3 188:22 195:22 199:22 217:23 whats (27) 15:2 30:9 31:7 32:20 32:20 48:21 59:18 63:13 77:9 81:3 82:18 85:16 90:8 90:17 94:15 108:11 116:14 125:11 137:17 140:19 151:11 190:2 200:10,11	208:9 227:17 229:22 wheres (1) 216:16 white (1) 223:13 whos (3) 92:23 139:12 143:13 whove (1) 135:21 wider (1) 213:6 wildlife (1) 30:23 willacoochee (1) 218:9 willagoochie (1) 211:6 willing (6) 85:8 96:5 98:6 112:6 118:6 146:18 wind (1) 131:8 winfab (1) 218:19 winners (2) 153:10 211:17 wire (10) 53:7 92:15 180:17 189:21,22 190:3 190:16 191:4 193:13 207:14 wires (1) 53:8 wisconsin (2) 142:3 163:17 wish (1) 150:18 wishes (1) 151:11 witnessed (1) 54:6 wk (3) 208:10,15 208:22 wonder (1) 9:4 wondering (2) 180:10 210:20 wont (6) 17:22 33:16 93:2 109:15 155:20 178:11 word (3) 40:22 88:19 193:14 wording (3) 72:6 88:5 175:16 words (1) 132:21 work (24) 6:8 10:3	25:22 78:6 82:5 102:19 107:21 111:13 116:18 117:11 161:17 173:20 175:3 178:12 181:8 189:20 202:23 203:2 205:2 210:10 214:18 222:12 223:4,8 worked (2) 177:11 200:22 working (5) 37:12 176:11 208:15,19 208:22 works (4) 155:9 157:5 214:17 222:13 world (5) 139:4 191:11,12 211:3 227:11 worried (1) 74:8 worry (3) 6:18 75:5 88:3 worse (1) 115:14 worth (2) 28:23 154:23 wouldnt (21) 13:19 14:18 43:4 53:16 63:18 66:19 70:10 70:11 76:13 82:3 88:18 97:12 103:23 105:8 144:3,21 192:6 206:6 208:2 214:21 223:8 woven (3) 138:2 190:16 199:18 wrapped (1) 36:18 wreck (1) 196:14 writeup (3) 33:3 177:6,12 written (7) 9:3 30:11 34:11 116:4 122:16 159:21	232:12 wrong (9) 27:16 51:17 122:12 175:7 195:7 206:10 218:4,5,5 X x (3) 89:20 147:5 221:9 Y yall (12) 88:4 93:5 125:22 138:13,14 158:18 159:7 160:15 163:6 195:2,4 197:20 yalls (2) 141:12,17 yanked (1) 201:16 yeah (23) 18:11 20:3,11 22:5 28:19,22 42:3,20 43:19 53:20 57:8 68:14 73:10 79:15 99:14 103:16 130:10 146:3 147:12 160:19 173:7 187:9 229:19 year (27) 6:2,4 56:10,19 58:7,19 58:23 59:14,16 61:20 82:8,9,10 82:16 97:6 98:12 107:13 132:16 155:5 156:20,22 156:23 157:8,9,18 157:19 158:3 years (58) 44:8 81:15 107:11 108:11 109:2,21 112:16,18 113:3,4 113:8 117:6,9 124:10,11,13,21 124:22 125:2 128:10 132:20,23
---	--	---	---	---

133:18 147:21 148:9,14 152:23 152:23 157:4 158:11,12,21,21 159:10,15 160:2,6 160:12 162:16 164:20,21 165:17 165:19 166:2,18 168:6 179:17,19 179:22 181:12 193:2,3,4,7 208:16,19 213:10 227:5 youd (10) 40:19 110:8,9 111:4 112:15,17,18 123:20,22 127:6 youll (4) 4:6 103:2 209:12 217:5 youre (77) 15:11 19:8 36:20 37:2,4 41:9 52:10 54:8 59:12 60:16 63:17 65:9 67:7 69:21 69:23 80:16 85:15 87:23 95:2 97:22 101:3,4 106:12,20 109:19 123:18 129:2,2 130:6 136:11 143:17 144:3,12 147:4 148:20 149:13 153:14,15 156:9 160:2 161:9 164:7 164:13 166:6,14 174:11 183:23 187:2,22 197:7,8 197:9 198:2 205:7 205:8,9,14 206:21 208:20 209:19,20 209:21 210:5,6,23 211:18 212:10 214:8 218:14 219:7 220:11 221:12 224:20,21	224:23 225:2 227:21 youve (11) 58:9,9 80:15 92:10 94:19 116:13 150:2 154:10 211:14 218:10 223:3 Z zero (2) 102:22 158:21 0 00 (3) 1:13 98:20 168:15 000 (13) 87:2,3,12 87:13,13 111:2,5 113:15 123:12 124:14 140:6 222:3 231:3 015 (1) 143:23 03 (11) 7:14 27:9 27:22 125:18 128:6 129:17 132:7 143:4,8,9 181:14 030 (1) 214:11 04 (1) 223:7 045 (9) 7:14 128:7 129:17 132:8 143:4,8,9,23 147:7 08 (4) 29:3 31:15 31:20 32:9 1 1 (34) 4:17 6:2,20 11:4,11,17,18 18:5 20:5,10 47:2 48:17 54:20 55:22 56:2 75:16 78:21 81:4 87:9 94:2,3 98:20 100:16 101:3 192:12,12 192:12,13 194:6,6 194:11,12 230:14	232:14 10 (5) 1:13 27:10 30:4 146:22 147:3 100 (2) 111:5 231:3 109 (1) 171:19 10th (1) 4:9 11 (2) 136:9 167:3 11340 (27) 9:5 104:19 105:11 109:4 111:7,13 112:15 114:8 115:5,6,11,18 116:4,12,14,23 117:3,16 118:9,10 125:14 208:10,15 211:12 221:6,8 224:8 11th (1) 232:16 12 (10) 57:5 61:19 80:17 87:13 98:19 146:22 147:3 167:3 208:16,19 129 (1) 46:12 12inch (1) 80:3 137 (2) 99:7 101:18 15 (4) 56:9,12 194:6,11 16 (2) 113:15 140:6 170 (1) 213:4 18 (3) 80:17 98:19 113:15 182 (1) 171:14 189 (1) 104:11 19 (1) 124:14 194 (2) 190:8,10 199 (1) 168:20 1st (6) 5:21 58:6 59:8 146:20 153:4 155:17 2 2 (35) 3:20 11:19 12:19,20 13:4,10 13:11,17 15:20 16:4,20 17:4 18:5	48:17 62:22 74:6 75:16 83:18 87:2 87:3,9,12 94:2,3 100:15,16,18,22 101:4 111:2 114:11 123:12,13 123:14 183:2 20 (7) 48:19 62:23 101:6 108:11,23 113:15 155:19 200 (1) 185:6 2000 (1) 175:4 2007 (1) 81:15 2010 (1) 136:8 2012 (2) 136:9 208:5 2014 (233) 1:1,7 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1	88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1 153:1 154:1 155:1 156:1 157:1 158:1 159:1 160:1 161:1 162:1 163:1 164:1 165:1 166:1 167:1 168:1 169:1 170:1 171:1 172:1 173:1 174:1 175:1 176:1 177:1 178:1 179:1 180:1 181:1 182:1 183:1 184:1 185:1 186:1 187:1 188:1 189:1 190:1 191:1 192:1 193:1 194:1 195:1 196:1 197:1 198:1 199:1 200:1 201:1 202:1 203:1 204:1 205:1 206:1 207:1 208:1 209:1 210:1 211:1 212:1 213:1 214:1 215:1 216:1 217:1 218:1 219:1 220:1 221:1 222:1
---	--	---	---	---

223:1 224:1 225:1 226:1 227:1 228:1 229:1 230:1 231:1 232:16 2015 (4) 5:21 6:20 59:9 97:2 2016 (3) 82:16 96:2 97:7 230 (1) 222:3 231 (1) 232:14 237 (1) 174:20 24 (3) 36:19 80:18 222:6 249 (1) 175:18 24hour (1) 175:12 25 (3) 76:15 79:3 222:6 26 (1) 222:6 2661 (1) 1:10 271 (1) 176:7 277 (1) 177:4 28 (232) 1:1,7 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1	74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1 153:1 154:1 155:1 156:1 157:1 158:1 159:1 160:1 161:1 162:1 163:1 164:1 165:1 166:1 167:1 168:1 169:1 170:1 171:1 172:1 173:1 174:1 175:1 176:1 177:1 178:1 179:1 180:1 181:1 182:1 183:1 184:1 185:1 186:1 187:1 188:1 189:1 190:1 191:1 192:1 193:1 194:1 195:1 196:1 197:1 198:1 199:1 200:1 201:1 202:1 203:1 204:1 205:1 206:1 207:1 208:1	209:1 210:1 211:1 212:1 213:1 214:1 215:1 216:1 217:1 218:1 219:1 220:1 221:1 222:1 223:1 224:1 225:1 226:1 227:1 228:1 229:1 230:1 231:1 2by2 (5) 181:19 191:6 192:14,20 214:19 2by4 (1) 192:13 2foot (3) 182:18 183:7 185:9 3 3 (21) 5:18 6:12 13:6 17:8,14 18:6 18:19,21,22 19:2 19:3 27:3 75:18 111:2 133:23 168:15 183:2 192:12,13 194:6 194:12 30 (17) 49:8 63:2,4 65:9 76:15 79:3 83:11,13 94:12,19 101:7,9,14 155:16 204:5 215:7 231:12 30677 (1) 1:11 36 (5) 36:19 80:18 193:21 215:3,14 3inch (1) 192:12 3to1 (1) 114:10 4 4 (16) 18:7,19 19:2 19:4,6,10,13,16 19:16,17 27:17 114:11 123:13,14 178:14 231:12 40 (2) 167:5 172:22 43 (1) 147:18 45 (1) 155:16	48 (6) 214:22 215:4 215:5,6 221:16,16 48inch (1) 214:23 4foot (15) 180:18 180:21 181:7,17 181:19 182:19 183:3,4,7,12 185:8 188:10 191:3 192:19 214:18 4inch (1) 133:23 5 5 (18) 19:17 20:10 20:19,20 48:17 54:20 75:16 87:9 94:2,3 99:6 100:16,17 101:3 101:17 178:22 192:12,12 50 (6) 76:17 111:5 117:9 155:21 185:6 195:5 500 (1) 185:5 50odd (1) 153:9 51 (2) 20:11 108:12 5141 (5) 108:8,21 109:6 110:6 221:22 52 (1) 108:12 54 (1) 147:2 55 (1) 203:23 59 (1) 20:17 5th (20) 7:5,11 13:20,22 23:16 60:4,19 62:12,12 78:19 81:3,8 82:4 161:6,7 170:15,16 177:17 178:2,4 6 6 (38) 5:2,2 10:18 12:12,14,15,20 13:3,15 14:3,17 15:3,5,17 16:4,5	19:8 20:23 21:4,5 21:10 23:23 24:6 26:3 46:12 72:13 87:13 99:3,5,7 101:18 104:9,12 123:13,14 168:20 171:14,17 60 (2) 56:5 195:5 60gram (1) 223:8 6121 (1) 26:14 6123 (1) 42:17 6124 (1) 72:13 6131 (1) 47:22 6139 (1) 170:14 6144 (1) 170:14 6197 (1) 192:9 6199 (1) 170:12 6208 (1) 170:13 6459 (8) 28:6 32:9 111:15 113:21 114:3,11 115:7 163:10 6460 (4) 102:7,12 102:20 103:7 65 (2) 46:11 153:20 6500 (5) 109:20 115:14 163:22 197:18 198:10 6foot (6) 180:13,20 181:8 183:13 187:15 188:11 6inch (1) 114:12 6th (21) 7:6,11 13:16,18,18 14:5 14:7,10,10 16:16 23:16 62:19 68:22 71:18 72:10 79:6 82:8,9 89:7 139:14 177:17 7 7 (1) 45:7 70 (3) 176:2 197:20 197:21 7208 (7) 48:16
--	---	---	--	--

73:21 74:18 75:3 75:9,23 93:17 7351 (1) 169:2 75 (3) 31:16,20 109:8 8 80 (5) 109:7 151:3 151:8 184:9 196:2 800pound (1) 221:14 8ounce (4) 198:20 198:22 199:5,13 8to1 (1) 114:9 9 9 (1) 105:12 90 (1) 27:11 9th (3) 3:21 5:7,18				
---	--	--	--	--