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

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

(Pause)

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

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

Moving to Item 2, the review of the October 9th Technical Advisory Committee meeting, as committee members and for the general public's knowledge, the transcript as transcribed by our court reporter, who is
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with us again today, has been posted to the Website, so that is up for public review. It has been posted online at our commission Website.

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

That was a very long meeting. We will anticipate hopefully our meeting today is not quite so long, but we will certainly be here as long as public comment takes us. At today's meeting public comment is
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Item 6. It will remain Item 6. It's our intent today, or my intent as moderator, to allow the committee to deliberate on the items on the agenda today, and we'll hold public comment at the end of the day's agenda.

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

Any questions about the last meeting of October the 9th? Hearing none, we'll move to Item 3, consideration and discussion on the version and contents of the Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia as of January 1st, 2015. Just as a point of reference for the committee before you begin your deliberations, Georgia code requires that as of January
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1 of each calendar year the manual in effect on that date is the manual that will be used for that calendar year. So we are a couple of months away from that date and the possible chance of that resetting or being different than what we currently have in place. We felt it was very important for the industry and professionals that design plans and those that are doing the work out on the construction sites to have some certainty as to what manual is in effect, and so today's discussion will be centered on that. So I will open that topic up for consideration, Item 3.

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

(No response)

Okay. Nobody wants to start. I'll start, get the discussion started. We provided with your agenda on
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the back of your agenda a stapled sheet, a summary of revisions. It's available to those in the audience also. This summary of revisions are the major changes that were made between the 5th Edition of the manual and the 6th Edition of the manual. Following up some of the Technical Advisory Committee comments since the last meeting, we thought it would be a good idea for you to have a listing of the major changes, so that's what you have before you, to know what changed predominantly between the 5th Edition and 6th Edition. We thought that might help you in your deliberation today.

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

MR. DYKES: How was it set and why was it set?

Ben, you want to take a stab at that?

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

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

I mean, as far as where we're at, if you move the numbers either way, it doesn't matter. The ultimate thing that really matters is that we have a process to allow new products to be in the manual. So where that number falls, I don't have a problem with making it straw bales, whatever you guys want to do. But we need a way to allow new products into the manual for erosion and sediment, regardless whether that's a silt fence that tweaks something that they do or it's a whole different kind of product that's out there that doesn't meet your traditional geotextile type of silt fence.
MR. MORAN: The way the manual would be written, if I had a -- we'll use silt fence as an example. If I had a new wonder silt fence, then I would have to test it against 11340 to get it to show what the P Factor was to get it approved.

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

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: I don't like the P Factor at all. I think it should be replaced with percent silt.
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retained. That gives you a better idea of how the things work. P Factors are numbers that are based off charts that has various assumptions.

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

MR. DYKES: Since we're talking about silt fence and the P Factor particularly here, and that gets down to Chapter 6, I'm going to make a suggestion. If the committee disagrees, then certainly let's go in a different direction. I'm going to suggest that we take the list here and start chapter by chapter, and where there is agreement, let's express agreement if the committee feels such. If there's not agreement, then
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let's express disagreement and discuss it. Otherwise I'm not sure we're going to get through what edition of the manual we have as of January 1 and we might be -- we want to get into these discussions. These are very important discussions, but we want to find if there's any agreement. If there's not, we want to make that known also. Let's do that. Is everybody okay with that as a committee?

FROM THE FLOOR: Sure.

MR. DYKES: Let's start with Chapter 1, and as you can see, minor changes have been made as far as referring to the Georgia code, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits added some guidance regarding minor land-disturbing activities and maintenance and abandoned sites. Does any committee member want to express any disagreement with Chapter 1 as edited? Seeing none, then Chapter 1 is agreed to.

Chapter 2 has been updated to include newly proposed BMPs, and pictures were replaced. Ben, will you explain a little bit what that means?

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

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

MR. BROWN: I don't know if symbols are going
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to change anything according to that. I mean, everything based upon Chapter 6 is regarding performance data, it's not based upon symbols, so I think Chapter 2 needs to be approved and we need to go forward with Chapter 3.

MR. WATSON: I agree.

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

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Glen's question is should we go back to the nomenclature in the 5th Edition, basically, for committee discussion.
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MR. HAMIL: No. I think we should go with the new Edition 6.

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

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

MR. DYKES: Or dislike, either way.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. I think all the new BMPs are a good thing for people to be able to use because it gives people more option of what to pick for
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their designs, but I don't know what's going to become of Chapter 6.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm sorry.

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: As moderator, what I will do is I will go chapter by chapter. We'll make agreement and disagreement as we go through. At the end I'll give you an opportunity to edit your comment to Chapter 2. I will come back to that. I didn't state that at the beginning because there are things that are linked together. So if that gives you comfort to know you have
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another opportunity on the full manual to make a comment or propose a change, certainly I'll come back. On Chapter 2 do I hear agreement to leave it as is or change?

MR. PARKER: Leave it as is.

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

Comments, questions, on Chapter 3?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: I think that should be removed.

MR. FAUCETTE: I agree.

MR. DYKES: That was an oversight, obviously.

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

MR. DYKES: Outside of that one change that
I've heard to this point on Chapter 3, are there other
changes you would propose regarding Chapter 3? Hearing
none, is there agreement other than the one edit to
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Sheet 3 and 4 of the plan? I see agreement. We'll make the one noted change on Chapter 3.

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: I agree with Chapter 4.

(Pause)

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

MR. WATSON: Glen, has the EPD address
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changed?

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: 5-1, yeah.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: That was Page 5-9?

MS. JORDAN: Correct.

MR. DYKES: Other changes to Chapter 5?

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

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

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

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

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

MR. DYKES: Okay. Hearing no comment, then Appendix A is agreed to. Appendix B-1 regarding soil series interpretation also was updated per information provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural
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Resource Conservation Service, soil properties, soil maps, things of that nature. Anybody want to express a comment on that? Eric, looks like you passed.

Mr. Harris: Yeah. I'll give our guys some props. The entire state is now complete for the first time ever.

Mr. Dykes: Eric Harris has joined us today from the Natural Resource Conservation Service. So Appendix B-1 stands approved. Appendix B-2 is estimating soil erosion using the revised Universal Soil Loss Equation.

Mr. Ruzowicz: I believe there is a public comment on this one as well, wanting to go back to the Universal Soil Loss Equation.

Mr. Dykes: Thank you for raising that comment, Ben.

From the Floor: What was it, Ben?

Mr. Ruzowicz: That we go back to the Universal Soil Loss Equation, I believe.

Mr. Dykes: Comments or changes proposed to Appendix B-2? Any comments? Seeing none, it's agreed to, Appendix B-2.
Appendix C was not changed from the prior manual to this manual. That might be the only thing that didn't change. Anybody want to propose a change to Appendix C? It's regarding riprap. Okay. Seeing no comment, Appendix C is approved as is.

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


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

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

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

MR. DYKES: No. Go ahead.

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

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

MR. HARRIS: Just a little bit of detail. I've had to answer velocity of what. Of course, we know what it is, but on this chart I've had several questions. Just explain the axes on this chart.
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MR. DYKES: Okay. So the comment is maybe add some terminology that allows better use for the chart, not changing the curve, not changing the information that's provided, but allowing for better usage of it. Any comments or disagreement from the committee regarding that?

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: For riprap selection?

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay.

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Ben, can you direct us to the
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actual comment, where that is?

MR. RUZOWICZ: So Page 3 of their comments:

What is the threshold of maximum C based on? Basically that number came from tackified straw to a slope. That was the original recommendation, that if something couldn't do as good as tackified straw to a slope, on a three-to-one slope, then it shouldn't basically be used.

Then they recommend setting the maximum C Factor at .03 for sensitive areas and .10 for nonsensitive areas, which is still a 90 percent effectiveness.

MR. DYKES: Ben, now currently is there two categories under this?

MR. RUZOWICZ: No, right now there are not two categories for this. It's just one. I'm sorry. I'm reading the wrong one. No. That's correct.

MR. PARKER: Number 4 under comments does apply to the slope stabilization, but then the P Factor comment is applied to sediment barriers.

MR. RUZOWICZ: No. They are asking for the C Factor there, top of the next page.

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

MR. DYKES: So for clarity for new committee
members and certainly the audience, from a performance standpoint, criteria were added to slope stabilization. Then what test or method is being used, Ben, if you don't mind?

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: Slope stabilization.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: Ben, do you think it's worth
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adding sensitive and nonsensitive qualifications since we just have a basic C Factor maximum of .08?

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: If we went with the
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recommendation, we would be lowering the performance threshold to below what was previously used.

MR. RUZOWICZ: At that .10, correct.

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

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

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

THE FLOOR: Green Book.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Eliminate it?

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: These were supposed to be generic specifications with no shalls next to them. The only shall that was in there was the blanket shall be nontoxic vegetation, seed, or wildlife products, shall
be determined to be nontoxic in accordance with the EPA.
Other than that, if somebody were to change something,
as long as they met that minimum criteria, these were
just general things for them to follow. We could add
another category if we needed to or revise the existing
categories, if that's what's needed. These were all
recommendations from before.

MR. HAMIL: I suggest we leave it as it is.
If we had to come up with a different number, we would
be arguing six months from now, so leave it as it is.

MR. DYKES: Mr. Hamil's recommendation is
leave it as it is. Is there any disagreement to leaving
the slope stabilization as it is using an ASTM and C
Factor of .08?

MR. RUZOWICZ: The first C Factor was .75, and
it went back to incorporate terminal velocity because
they did a recalculation on that through all the tests.
So that's why the number, from what originally came out
to now, went from .75 to .08.

MR. PARKER: I'm fine with leaving the
performance the way it is, but I think we ought to look
at some of their other comments.
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MR. MORAN: I don't have any problem with performance, but if you read this, the only thing that's accepted was the straw blanket. Is that what the DOT has too?

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. Anyplace there is a shall, except for the other thing, we could put it to a
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right, yes.

MR. FAUCETTE: I support that too. I think
the original intent behind the performance criteria was
to induce innovation and higher performance and not
restrict that moving forward, so I support that too.
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MR. RUZOWICZ: So change them all to should except for the toxicity requirements.

MR. DYKES: Committee members agreeable to that change? Okay. Other changes to slope stabilization that would be proposed at this time? Any other discussion on slope stabilization at this time?

I'm going to go to Reece. Looks like he's in deep thought. I don't want to overlook him.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Materials.

MR. PARKER: The materials. Kind of goes back to what I was saying earlier, my previous comment. But that opens up a whole other thought, which is the longevity, and I think I've been on one side of the spectrum this whole process about longevity. I've always thought that longevity is not important for us to try to control, and here we are trying to put limits around longevity. I guess I just have a problem with that in general, but I've been overridden by the committee for sure on that.
MR. FAUCETTE: Ben, can you refresh our memory here? Were these taken from another source, ECTC or --

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Let me suggest this: I think as I look at it, we're saying that's the categorization of those various products based on how the netting will hold up and how long before it degrades. There isn't an assumption that we're actually expecting that these products have to meet that performance period and would somehow be tested for such a period. I mean, the ASTM test is not that. I don't know that this is bad in terms of the information, but maybe it's in terms of presentation that it ought to be for the designer's information only. Again, as far as categorization goes, I don't think it does anything to detract from the ASTM testing. I think the testing gives whatever result it gets. I think we are probably getting wrapped around the axle in terms of where we do say functional longevity is, 24 months, 36 months. If I'm the designer -- and you're right, Reece. I would tend to agree with you -- I'm going to look at my individual project and make that decision based on needs.
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MR. PARKER: And I guess you're right. These are more guidelines. You don't have to specify on the plan whether you're using an extensive term or not.

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Fair enough.

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

MR. PARKER: Okay. Thanks for my education.

MR. DYKES: Any other discussion on slope
MR. RUZOWICZ: So the shalls to should.

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Glen, are you saying that we
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either need to exclude mention of the material or expand the types of materials described?

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: This is just for consideration: Could you remove the word "straw" and get away with just "blanket," because then you could --
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MR. MORAN: You could, but you would also have construction type built in here too, and that table doesn't have a construction type.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Any other changes?
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MR. PARKER: That means leaving the shall?

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

MR. PARKER: I agree.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Except for the toxicity requirements.

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

MR. PARKER: That's a good point.

MR. RUZOWICZ: In what section?

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Under the note?

MR. MASTRONARDI: Yeah.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So add a number seven?

MR. MASTRONARDI: That would be fine. I think if I were in my partner's shoes with DNR, I would want
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to have something to inspect by.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: What it has for each BMP.

Guerry, is there something else you can think of?

MR. THOMAS: No.

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

MR. PARKER: It says per --

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

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

MR. WATSON: I thought we talked during the
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

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

MR. DYKES: As part of each plan.

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

MR. RICHARDSON: It does mention that under criteria. It says, "Installation and stapling of RECPs and application rates of the ATCPs shall conform to the
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manufacturer's guidelines for application."

MR. WATSON: Thank you.

MR. DYKES: Any other comments on slope stabilization?

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

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

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

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

MR. PARKER: It's almost like we could lift that note to a higher level and say anything used as a slope stabilization BMP has to be installed the same way it was installed when it was tested for performance. I think that's a key thing. Manufacturer's recommendation has got to match, or the way it was tested is the manufacturer's recommended method. And who documents that? My understanding is it's being documented by TRI.
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It's been documented by TRI. It would be documented by the testing agent that's used for performance testing. And then those test results would be accompanied with an installation method, and that becomes the approved method for installation. I think we just need to articulate that on each one of these performance-based BMPs at a high level, at a general level.

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

It's in every section.

MR. PARKER: I like that.

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

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

MR. DYKES: I prefer to stay with this.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the comments that we got
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is that straw bales should not be an option as checkdams. They have been removed from states across the country because they simply do not perform.

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

MR. DYKES: Other comments on straw bale checkdams?

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: So the group had decided to go with an existing ASTM, 7208, which they modified to use a clay soil, reducing the flow amounts to .5, 1, and 2 CFS, running those three different flows. From that they took a recommendation within 20 percent of control. I believe that's what it was. And also that it didn't have a blowout. There's been questions as to what's defined as a blowout, so one of the things we could do is not even specify a blowout since it's not defined
anywhere, not even specify if something blows out or not, just take into account what the difference is between the control and whatever the amount is we specify. There's also been a recalculation done, and I believe that was for the wetted area of the slope, which changed some of the numbers, which also changed the recommendation that came to us to 30 percent of control. There's also been some concerns brought up that we tested the compost filter sock and it wasn't installed properly per specification. I'm just trying to recap everything on the whole, if I've missed anything.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: I would say since there's controversy around the W pattern silt fence, the compost sock, leave those two out of what we're looking at, nothing against anybody's stuff, and go with the straw and rock that we already have. And anybody that wants to come back and retest, just be within so much of whatever the control is that you guys decide. I don't know if that's what you guys want or whatever, but maybe
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That's a way to go about it. There was one other thing, the shape of the channel that we had. Somebody had said it wasn't a real-life shape of a channel.

MR. DYKES: The testing channel?

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: But I guess my comment to that would be, if we said that it failed based upon a blowout and so the test was not completed, had it not
blown out, what would have been those numbers? And vice versa, whether you take compost filter sock out, put silt fence is, whatever you do. I think it's a broader question. If we are going to speak to the manual, in terms of the manual, I don't think we can separate that from those questions that exist for the testing.

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

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

MR. PARKER: It would be good if every failing BMP had a chance to be redone, for the supplier to have a chance to have it retested, that we initially tested
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and failed. And the GDOT silt fence, I'd like to see it installed such that the DOT agrees that it was installed per plans, and then we can say we really did test the GDOT check barrier. I don't know if Joel, Dr. Sprague, was going to do that for no additional funds.

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

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

MR. BROWN: Can that check that you guys are talking about, the DOTW is what I call it, can that be installed properly in the slope that TRI has? Because
every slope or ditch line is different, and I just
wanted to make sure that it can be installed according
to DOT specs and their required slope.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Knowing that following discussion
of this matter is having a manual on January 1, knowing
that any testing would have to be done between now and
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January 1 and this committee would have to decide what that performance criteria would be based on that testing, that's something we need to keep in mind as a committee. We've got two months, 60 days, to provide some type of clarity.

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Just for clarification, Kirby, are you saying the existing products that are accepted,
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include those?

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

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

MR. HAMIL: Yeah.

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right.

MR. HAMIL: But the DOT and the local governments could refuse product or put it in. It would be up to their discretion. So nothing would be -- if a county or city or state didn't like a particular way, they could say okay, you can't use it, our criteria says you can't use that one.
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MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the matter that is before the two state departments is that the regulator would rely on the manual, and short of a memorandum of agreement or something that would recognize the silt fence checkdam come January 1st we'd be where we've been earlier in this year, that is, without the use of them.

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: I'm agreeing. The time frame now is at a point that this has already been held up a year,
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and one of the original intents was to come up with a way to get new products in here. And to get a hundred percent concurrence in the next two months, five days, is silly. If something like that gets presented into the manual, this would be something that -- I actually don't think it should be called an amended manual. I think it should be a manual that comes out January 1st of 2015. And then if we talk about this -- because once you say amended, that takes a little bit of the credibility, in my opinion, away; that you put out this thing, and if you're going to put a grandfathered, in quotes, clause, that it's pretty clear here's what is the plan over the next year and here's the approach. Like, if it's silt fence checkdam is going to be included for the next year, we're going to test the ones that failed, kind of all that language in there and make it very clear this is what's being done, instead of holding up the process.

Because there's a lot of good information that's being held up because of a few comments. They are good comments, but that's what a lot of this is getting at. That's why we're here meeting again.
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MR. RUZOWICZ: I'd just like to make a comment. You guys all have a packet of information, and this information is what was in the 5th Edition of the manual. So if we go and we look at the checkdam -- I'm not against silt fence and I do think somebody will get a silt fence passed one day as a checkdam, but in our existing specifications there's stone checkdams, hay bale checkdams, and that's it. There's not a spot for silt fences. There are other kinds of silt fences out there besides just your geotextile kind. So when you guys make all these different comments, does that open it up for more than just geotextile type silt fences? I mean, how far are you guys going with the general recommendation as far as the type of silt fence and all that kind of stuff, if you're going to allow it, since it was never in here before?

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: All I was saying originally is
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the stone and the hay bales or straw bales, whatever you want to call it, nobody has questioned that testing.

Maybe you can come up with a recommendation off those two so that new products that want to come forward from those can continue on and we're not holding anybody up.

I don't know if that's a bad idea or a good idea, but it's just a way that somebody can continue, if they have a product that's being held up somewhere, to continue on and have a process for it.

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: I would just remind you that
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the factors were developed inclusive of a product we could eliminate.

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: I think when you go back and you look at the revised numbers, I'm going off memory, but I think that the compost sock at the 2 CFS flow was the highest one. So the old recommendation was 20
percent; the new recommendation was 30 percent. And at the new recommendation everything had to fit in there, so the rock and the straw would still fit in there at 30 percent control. But if you want to make it higher, the only other thing is I would say definitely we would take out the definition of what a blowout is, because, if we are specifying a number, it doesn't matter somebody's opinion as far as what a blowout is or what a blowout isn't.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: That's as far as I know.

That's all I can remember.

MS. FULLARD: As a regulator, it would be very
difficult if we grandfather products that weren't in the
book to begin with. While I understand the DOT, those
aren't slopes and wets that are typical to a normal
development, and this is catering to a larger
development. So unless it met the testing criteria that
we had set originally I'm not sure I would feel
comfortable just opening it up to a bunch of products
that weren't in the original manual nor made the testing
criteria in the new manual. Again, I feel fairly
comfortable with the results that we got on the
checkdams.
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MR. RUZOWICZ: The number would need to be revised for those recalculations that were found.

MS. FULLARD: Right.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: The performance recommendation.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: That was the new recommendation.

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

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think it still comes down to if there's agreement on the installation being...
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acceptable or not. If that was not, then the reality is we don't know the result. The test was called on the basis of a blowout while the data was continued to be collected, and it still goes back to was it installed properly for our detail. It could be run again and it may absolutely fail, but I would like to have that opportunity.

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Not for the department.

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: No. Well, we could, but we try to eliminate them because they create a roadside hazard. They're either going to be behind a guardrail or outside of a guardrail.
MR. RICHARDSON: This says under maintenance that they're supposed to be removed once final stabilization has occurred.

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: What we're talking about grandfathering in are just the products we selected to use as baseline data to test, right? We are not talking about grandfathering all products. I kind of agree with Adena that maybe, if it was not in the Green Book to begin with, so why should it be grandfathered in now,
the GDOT check? If that's the case, then there's nothing else we'd be grandfathering in and we just move forward. And if somebody wants to test the GDOT one, and I think Dr. Sprague ought to live up to what he said and do it again for GDOT, then it would be included in the Green Book if they pass, just like all the other products.

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

MR. PARKER: And now it's in.

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

MR. HAMIL: In this one you got the straw and the rock and the compost filter socks, in that 6th Edition.
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. The specification hasn't changed as far as the slope and the way that they're put out. Depending on the height is when -- the bottom of one basically is the top of another in the slope, depending how it is. So if you have a product that's not as tall, you're going to have more of them. If you can get a product to pass that's twice as tall, you're going to need that many less. So depending on
how you make your product and what you can get it to do during testing is going to depend on how it's installed for the generic stuff, whether you have one, or whether you have two, and how close they are. When we tested this stuff, we tested one, just because to be fair to the manufacturers.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: No. That was the W pattern that we were looking at. There are some studies out
there as to different ways, why silt fences are installed different ways, and there's no doubt in my mind down the line somebody is going to find a way to get a silt fence to pass the checkdam test. And when they do, they'll have a product that, who knows, somebody will want to buy. And who knows what other kind of BMPs that are going to come up with checkdams. For all I know, and we're talking about three things right here, there could be, when we open this up, ten different BMPs that do things differently that could do just as well a job that we're not even thinking of right now.

MR. BROWN: Looking back at the compost filter sock, there's nothing in here as far as installation per manufacturer. Also, on the detail it doesn't say anything about that. I think for a checkdam standpoint, as far as the way the 6th Edition is, if we add some notations as far as meeting the specs for the manufacturer on installation for the socks, then we should leave the stone checks, the straw bales, and the socks how they are, just add a notation per manufacturer's recommendation. Because I know in the
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past there was a question on how all of the socks were
installed, if they're installed properly with this many
stakes or that many stakes, but each one of them is
going to be different. So if we put a specification in
here or wording in here stating that, then that
eliminates any questions as far as proper installation
for each product.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: Is that the one used by TRI?
MR. BEHREND: There was a public comment about the soil type.

MR. RUZOWICZ: What was the comment?

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Say that again, Ben.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I would assume that they're wanting to go to the -- I don't know this. They want to go back to whatever the traditional 7208 went with for generic purposes so that they don't have to pay to retest. The committee had decided to go with the clay type soil, so that changes it so that they would have to go back and retest more toward the clay soil that we find in Georgia. It says, "Manufacturers would have to
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retest each product, which would drive up the cost to
the State of Georgia. Existing ASTM 7208 should be
acceptable for approval." So that goes from the clay to
the sandy loam. And then the worry was that if we have
flows that are that high all the time, are we just going
to blow out every single BMP.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: I believe they're higher.

MR. PARKER: We deviated from that as well.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't remember the numbers.

I know we're .5, 1, and 2, and I know there was two in
the other one but I can't remember the number.

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Are you saying we should allow all soil types and just have one performance number or we should have soil types and have different performance
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numbers for each soil type?

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

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

MR. WATSON: If somebody is stating that they've got a product that is meeting a percent reduction, then if people start applying it and it's not meeting it, then, one, that product is probably not going to be bought because it's not being met, or it's
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not meeting the criteria, or the commission may not
approve the plan because they'll say your stuff, we're
continually seeing that it's failing.

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

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

MR. DYKES: One option to consider might be
in this case what was in the 5th Edition, adopting that
to go in the place of this, checkdams, but allowing new
products as of January 1 to meet a new standard. That
would allow you to bring new products in, checkdams that
could be used, but it would also allow new products
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moving forward, you know, if you had concerns or questions about the test or the 30 percent or 25 percent control, whatever it is. That might be one option.

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

FROM THE FLOOR: There's controversy over that.

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: On the compost sock for checkdam, it says, "Compost sock size to suit conditions. See approved list." I can't find an approved list, but the question is what size sock was used in the test to see if it would pass or fail, in the TRI test. Ben, do you
MR. RUZOWICZ: The 12-inch, I believe.

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

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: I don't either.
MR. DYKES: Hence the discussion on taking what's in the 5th. Every minute that goes by we're closer to January 1, and at the end of the day Glen at EPD is going to be asking what is the recommendation. We need clarity for the industry, certainly, those installing.

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: That's right.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: There is another one for
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checkdam as well.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

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

MR. WATSON: I completely concur. And if it helps people to be comfortable and we're going to have some sort of -- I don't know where you put it in here,
but some, I'm calling it a grandfather clause but that's probably not a right term, specifically call out these two are going to be retested, you know, actually call those out so that it's not, doesn't give the impression that because filter sock was in this one and it's approved, that it means that it's going to stay in. But at least the testing that was done it did pass.

MR. BROWN: I agree.

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

MS. JORDAN: For now keep what we have.

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

MR. PARKER: Are we going to keep the modified ASTM or are we going to go to the nationwide? That's just another thing we need to decide, maybe separately. I like the idea.
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MS. JORDAN: I don't see any problem leaving it with the clay loam modified test method unless there's a huge pool of data out there that's getting thrown out because it was done on sandy soil.

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

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: That's been discussed but there's nothing formal.
MR. HAMIL: If I were still around I'd want additional money for every test.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: It's only one product we're
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talking about, because the rolled product already passed. So we couldn't make the rolled product manufacturer pay for a retest.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: So let's really dance around the elephant in the room. How much does it cost to do a test?
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MS. JORDAN: $2,000.

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Each flow, yes.

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm not sure that's the real elephant. I think the question -- and again, my role as an adviser and nonvoting member is to get you thinking. Brent raised the question to the group: Would you say the installations were acceptable per those manufacturer's installation or the guidance provided? That has to be -- there has to be some conclusion on that. You can agree there's controversy, but that's nebulous. You're not going to get anywhere until you
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say either yes, we support it, or no, we don't. And at
that point you can worry about what your next step is.

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Right. Exactly.

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

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

MR. PARKER: And then the rolled product, I
would say it was installed properly because the
manufacturer was there to ensure it.
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MR. MASTRONARDI: Did you say it was installed properly or was installed per the manufacturer's instruction? I know that might be semantic, but my point would be this — and it was brought up at the last meeting, and I'm not going to belabor it. I'm going to try to restrain myself. But there's a detail in the 6th Edition and there's a different staking that's there. That's what the picture showed me.

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: There was nine stakes in the picture.
MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm not going to speak to a number.

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: What's that?

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

MS. JORDAN: So that's what I was getting at, is we still have the performance criteria number to go by, but again, that was derived from a whole set of
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products, many products, that were tested. We don't know if we were to retest silt fence and if we were to retest the compost filter socks, would that change the envelope, which therefore might change our performance criteria. That's why I'm saying, if money's no object, if we could retest those and see if that changes our number, but in the meantime let's go ahead and use what we've got.

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

MR. WATSON: I think I agree with you that the DOT silt fence, TRI needs to prove they installed it
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correctly. If they didn't, then they need to retest it.
If they did install it correctly, then now it's on DOT or whoever to now pay for any additional tests.

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: So talking about who's paying for
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it, if TRI won't redo it, it sounds like, only thing I can come up with is out of the commission budget.

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

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

FROM THE FLOOR: No.

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

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

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

FROM THE FLOOR: Clay.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So then the clay, so that's the same. Do you want to revise it back to the traditional way with all the flow rates that were there before, or
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do you want to leave it with the .5, 1, and 2?

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: I think it should.

MR. DYKES: Mr. Watson says yes.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I see a no.

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

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

MR. WATSON: I'm fine with that, putting in a one-year period, a due date that needs to be provided. I don't know who is paying for the testing. I still think that's one of the big elephants in the room, you know, but I think it gives a one-year option for those to be included, and if they're not, then they're not.
They're not going to be in for the 2016.

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: I mean, we're again getting back to we're trying to come up with a way for new products to come in. That's a product that's been there as long as I've been practicing, well, kind of early on. But compost filter sock has always been there. We've just now called it out with something -- you know, now it's got its own call-out. It passed regardless if there's debate on whether or not it was installed correctly. It appears to be that it was, but I think leave it as is. But I think there needs to be some, and I don't know what to call it, something in the new edition coming out
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in 2015 that qualifies some of these things that we're
talking about, about these two particular items are
going through this one-year trial period, whatever the
terminology is, that they're going to be somehow
reevaluated over the next year as to whether or not they
make it into the 2016 edition.

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

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

There's a lot of opportunity.

MR. DYKES: To come to a conclusion maybe
before lunch, if you're in favor of leaving the generic
compost filter sock in the new edition of the manual,
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raise your hands in the meeting room. Those in opposition? Anybody abstain? Okay. The committee's recommendation is that it stays in. On the Georgia DOT W installation, it's not called for in the manual. It doesn't reference it in the manual. Anybody willing to say they would like to add that to the manual? Does anybody agree it needs to be rested? Raise your hand. Thank you. Is there any other discussion on checkdams?

Seeing none --

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

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

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

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

(Lunch Recess)

(Adena Fullard was not present after the lunch recess.)
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MR. DYKES: We are going to call the meeting back to order and continue with Chapter 6, comments and discussion. We are looking at major revisions of Chapter 6. We finished up checkdams before the break. Item 5 is the channel stabilization section of Chapter 6. That starts on Page 137.

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: I'm sorry. I thought of something at lunch. I think the committee's recommendation was to have the fabric checkdam, silt fence checkdam retested. I just wanted to know what would, quote, be passing, if we keep in mind that it was used as part of the methods that were going to generate the data set to create the P Factor. Is it a matter of
simply pass/fail with regards to a blowout? Or are you going to hold it to a P Factor that it was not part of generating the average for?

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: It wasn't a P Factor for this test. It was whether they specified a blowout or a nonblowout, and then within so much of control. So every single test that's run is compared to its control, so that if you have a person that is doing this test in another laboratory, it's compared to their control that's set up the same way, so hopefully it takes out that variability that might be there. So it's within percent of so much of control at the 2 CFS flow.

Originally we had looked at the .5, the 1, and the 2. The .5 weren't taken into consideration because they looked at the 2. But originally it was thought we might have some smaller BMPs that would only pass the lower flows that could be used in lower flows. After going back and looking at it, the check, the rock and straw bales both passed the 2 CFS flows, so they said if they could do that, basically everything should be able to do
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that. In looking at that, it's possible that you might not even have to test for the .5 or the 1 if you're not truly using that; you're only looking at the 2. But it was within so much of control. The original recommendation was 20 percent, I believe, and the new recommendation is within 30 percent of control. Then they said they didn't want to use blowouts, so it would just be within 30 percent of the control.

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Okay. Fair enough.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Okay. Basically the manual is the same as it was before as far as categories with the
feet per second that was there. What they did is they added, so that you could have a shear stress, they added a note in there that shear stress equipment was okay. It's also noted that people can be more stringent than what is already in the manual. The test that they went with was 6460 and the existing ASTM for channel stabilization, which I believe DOT has some studies from Georgia Tech which more greatly breaks it down even further but still falls into these same generic specifications that we have.

When you look at that ASTM 6460, it gives you the equivalency per second and shear stress right next to one another on the front cover, so you are able to see that. So whether the DOT is specifying shear stress or an engineer wants to use feet per second, the front of that test should be able to give you the information that you need so that the DOT and the existing manual will be able to work together and allow new products into the manual while running the test for 6460. But other than the specifications that are here, it's the exact same zero to five, five to ten, and then ten above. So if you look at the stuff that I handed out
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earlier with the existing specifications, you'll be able to see how the channel stabilization was drawn up.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Yeah. Where is it at?

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

MR. DYKES: Any other comments on channel stabilization?

MR. BROWN: I think if that one line item is removed, we wouldn't have any problems with it.
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MS. JORDAN: I would say change shall to should.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: Yes.

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

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

MR. HAMIL: I think the test is much too complicated. I think we should do away with the P Factor and just have percent retained. I think all the products that are currently being used, the socks and silt fence, would be grandfathered in. The test now runs nine tests on each product, three for each rainfall. I think we should eliminate it down to one rainfall, and that would mean only three tests would have to be run and that the test then would cost considerably less, and the tests could be set up where a
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local testing company could do it. And I think we set
up the slope, the rainfall, pick one of the rainfalls,
and the length of the test slope, et cetera, should be
set where it could be easily set up by a local tester
here in Georgia. And if we grandfathered the ones in,
if a local government or the State decides they don't
like one of the products, that's their prerogative, plus
the design engineer should be able to set it up if he
wants a particular product.

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: Well, I'm recommending only one
rainfall and to set up a certain slope, amount of water,
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well, the rainfall would set the amount of water, but
the length of the slope and et cetera. Because right
now it costs several hundred thousand dollars to set up
a test site, best I could learn.

MR. DYKES: Other discussion?

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

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

MR. DYKES: Comments?

MR. FAUCETTE: I do have a little bit of
concern creating a test method from scratch. I think it
would be a lot for either this committee or another
committee to take on to create something from scratch
and then have an organization that is unknown at this
point to be able to build it and run it all within that
time frame. I think it's a lot of work. It's quite
expensive, and then I think there would also be the
question that would have to be asked is it acceptable
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that the State would require testing at only one laboratory. The current one can be done by multiple laboratories.

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

My only heartburn, being a geotextile manufacturer, silt fence manufacturer for the last 20
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some years, everything we ever do is ASTM. It's not something else that's not been approved by ASTM. If this 11340 is an ASTM test or modified test, I can see it. I think you do have to have a performance test method or standard of some sort. And the states, 5141, set it up themselves, at 80 percent filter efficiency how many gallons per minute, so forth, or you can do 75, whatever it is you want to do, depends upon your state.

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

MR. HAMIL: That sounds much better.
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

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

MR. FAUCETTE: I do remember, Bob, and I know you weren't there in the previous committee, but we did look really closely at that method and discussed it. Aside from some of the issues that Ben brought up, the group also wanted something more large scale as well, not bench scale in nature. They thought it would better replicate closer to real-world conditions but still having some sort of standardization. And then also the sediment concentrations I think they use in that test
are extremely low. I think they're 2- to 3,000 milligrams per liter of sediment, which is not anything you'd ever see on a construction site. On construction sites we often see 50- to 100,000 milligrams per liter, which is something more like what we'd see in the test that we did run, 11340. So those are some of the discussions we had, and one of the reasons we didn't choose it to begin with. We did talk about it as a potential option earlier.

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: I agree.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: No. The idea was that you'd run it once. Once every three years you'd send a letter saying that your product hasn't changed. If you weren't able to give us a certified letter saying that your product had not changed, then you would have to go back and redo the test because you changed a property within your product that originally had passed. That was the
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thought behind it, not to make you go back and retest every three years. It was one time. Then you submit a letter every three years, notarized or however, saying that your product has not changed or undergone any kind of -- you know, basically isn't a different product from what you originally tested. That was the original talk, not that you have to retest it every three years.

MR. MORAN: (Inaudible)

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: To be what?

MR. HAMIL: Three different rainfalls to check it.

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

MR. DYKES: That's news to me. I thought we
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were using the test method, and now we're saying we're using ASTM 6459.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: It isn't an ASTM, but it closely follows.
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MR. DYKES: And that's what we're going to proceed with, it's not an ASTM. That's my understanding. Does anybody disagree with the fact that 11340 is not an ASTM?

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Right.

MR. DYKES: It's not an established ASTM. I just want to deal with the facts. It may model something, and that's great, but it either is or isn't
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MR. FAUCETTE: But just to be clear, we are not following 11340 as it's written, either.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: No.

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

MR. HAMIL: Too complicated.

MR. DYKES: Mr. Hamil says too complicated.

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

MR. BROWN: Any test method that's agreed upon I think there's going to be questions either way.

Whether we use the 11340 or we use an ASTM, we're going
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to have the same questions. I agree with Betty Jean
that using 11340 is the best way to go.

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

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

Again, this was provided while we were at
lunch and it makes the point, again, that some products
that were used had Bentonite applied and others did not.
I think that issue is not going to go away. If we are
silent on that, I don't think it goes away. I think
those concerns are going to be there. The question is
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whether or not, to me personally, I suppose, again, it's not whether or not TRI is comfortable with the results that were obtained; it's that the TAC is, that in your mind you can square those issues to say, "I would be willing to defend that. I'm comfortable with everything it indicates."

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

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

MR. PARKER: The Georgia version of it.

MR. DYKES: The Georgia version with the clay and the slope, yes. Those opposed? Okay. Thank you.

All right. Let's talk about the methods, the testing method or the results that came from that.

MR. MASTRONARDI: The execution.

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Do you think all of it or some of it?
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MR. HAMIL: I think if we proceed on and approve it, we're going to be in real trouble.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: The whole thing what we were doing was to set benchmark standards. There's been a lot of talk about the Bentonite causing different outcomes. It allowed for it but it looks like a lot of people don't like it. There is a lot of them that were already run without using Bentonite. We're looking at just setting up a benchmark standard, so can we look at those ones that had no Bentonite in them just to set a minimum number and have a benchmark number so we can
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allow people who are new to come into the manual, a process to come in? And at the same time keep the traditional A, B, and C for a while until everybody has had a fair chance to do whatever. I don't know. I'm just thinking out loud. I don't know if that's the right thing or not.

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

MS. JORDAN: I have a question about the use of Bentonite in the test that somebody can clarify for
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me. It's allowed in the testing procedure, and seems like, if I remember correctly, it was only installed in a particular test run if it was needed. Like if it started getting seepage under or around, then they'd stop the test, put the Bentonite on, and then resume the test. So maybe in some runs it wasn't an issue so they didn't have to put the Bentonite. I don't think it was the testing lab saying okay, we're going to put Bentonite on this test but not on this one. I mean, there was a reason for them to put it on some tests and not others.

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

MR. WATSON: I'd have to defer to some of the folks who have done a lot more tests in this. Did the use or lack of use of Bentonite affect the P results? I don't know that from my experience. I'm not saying one
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way or the other, so I'd have to defer to other folks.
I think that would be -- somebody asked that earlier, I
think Brent. And if it did affect it, or if it has the
opportunity to affect it, then I think it needs to be
reevaluated.

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

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

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

MS. JORDAN: I do have it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: You'd have to run it nine times for each product; where if you only had one rainfall, you'd only have to run it three times, the way I figure it.
MR. MASTRONARDI: Brent, you asked if there were any other comments. The only thing I would say is that Bentonite wasn't the only concern that was raised.

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Do you have a recommendation?

MR. HAMIL: Five years.

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

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

MR. WATSON: I think five years is too long.

I'd go with the three years because that's when the letter needs to come and reevaluate it with the
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commission. I think five years is a little long.

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

MR. HAMIL: Not by me.

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

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Based off this test?

MR. HAMIL: I don't like this test, but y'all have already agreed on the test, so then yes. Percent
silt retained, everybody understands that. To understand the P Factor you got to go back and look at all the equations and all the variables that they selected numbers for to come up and figure out what it means, which it took me a long time to do.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: The one thing with the P Factor
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is that it can be inserted into the equation, and we have already agreed here that the C Factor is okay to put into that equation. Are we going to say that the P Factor is not? That's open for discussion.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Right.

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: There was one suggestion at one point to take the highest value so that, at least within these products, they would be, they would all get into
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the system, and then there would be, down the road when
more testing -- I'm not saying who is paying for it.
Just down the road as more tests came in, that that
would be added and the number would be revised. I can
easily see the debate where people say that the .03 and
the .045 are somewhat arbitrary, so I'd also be fine
with going with a max P value on the two different types
to come up with that, with the understanding, because
it's going to happen as years go on and more data comes
in, that those numbers will be revised.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: I do remember that discussion.
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Just so I'm clear what you're saying, you're saying instead of having two levels, are you saying have one where all the current products that were tested would fit in, with the idea that down the road this committee or another committee would explore as more data comes in?

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

MR. WATSON: I don't know what the right answer is. My gut says that there should be a sensitive and nonsensitive, and there's so many different ways of arguing. I think as long as we can back -- I think there should be two numbers. I'll answer it that way.

I think there should be a sensitive and nonsensitive. I'm not in favor of the .03 and .045 as eyeball numbers. I think there should be some statistic to come up with what those numbers are. I'm probably more in favor of doing a standard deviation based on the number of points that there are. That would be my recommendation. And I think, when I've done the math, I think actually all the products then become, they would fall within the two
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

sensitive and nonsensitive ranges.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WATSON: Potentially, yes.

MR. FAUCETTE: Or neither?

MS. JORDAN: Or neither. If we did that, right now we would have nothing approved for nonsensitive only. Everything would be nonsensitive and
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sensitive. If we were to do that, is there any desire to revisit the way any of the testing was done? We don't have issues on this like we did with the checkdams. Bentonite was really the main issue on the installation.

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Installation of which BMP?

MR. BEHREND: The sock.

MR. RUZOWICZ: The compost sock?

MR. BEHREND: Too many stakes.

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: What does DOT specs say for compost socks as far as sediment barriers? Does it say stakes every two feet?
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

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

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

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

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

MS. JORDAN: In other words, do a statistical analysis now to get those numbers. New products that are brought online in the next three years would be
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added to that. At the end of the three-year period do
another statistic evaluation. It may be that some
products actually that are on here now may get kicked
out if the deviation was shrinking.

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Not that I remember.

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

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

MR. BROWN: Which category.

MR. MASTRONARDI: This is a little facetious
but at some point you put a piece of 3/4-inch plywood
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1 out there, right? And then the only thing that passes
2 is equivalent barrier. I don't think we mean that.
3
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
16 MR. DYKES: So I hear two things. One is all
17 products that were tested will be accepted. And then I
18 hear all products in the DOT qualified products list
19 would be put into a category. Which of the two are we
20 talking about? Because I've heard both. I think
21 Mr. Hamil's recommendation was all products currently on
22 the QPL list DOT list.
23
24 MR. HAMIL: No. All products currently being
25 used by entities in the state of Georgia.
MR. DYKES: That's a much broader list than the DOT. Now we have three. I don't know what that list is, but it's much broader than the DOT. And you have the DOT's qualified products list, and then you have what was tested, which is in the presentation that you have before you, and there's people in all categories.

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

MR. HAMIL: One.

MR. WATSON: Just one.

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Not necessarily.

MR. WATSON: I would say the ones who've come up with the new P Factors through a statistical evaluation.
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MR. HAMIL: Natural Growth Industries' products hasn't done the test but they sent in a list of four things that they had to meet and be qualified, and that was accepted.

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: Right.

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: That's very broad.

MR. RUZOWICZ: It is very broad.

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: It was approved by the commission.

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: When you got different products, you got different things that make them up. There could be some different concerns in compost socks such as fecal coliform, all kinds of stuff that come up as far as stuff like that. So every product is different regardless of whether you have a silt fence
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and it's woven different or you have different compost
in it or you have different kind of recycled carpet,
different kinds of Styrofoam. I don't know all the
different stuff that could come up.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: I think the communication was it
has the elements of the four requirements but it's on a
per-plan-by-per-plan basis. We don't have the authority
to do that. So we got three lists. We've got all
possible alternatives. We've got what DOT recognizes,
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the qualified products list. We have what was tested through TRI as part of the testing contract. That’s the world of possibilities. And there’s people that may be on all the lists or some lists.

MR. HAMIL: Filtrexx got their test run free.

MR. DYKES: Yes, sir.

MR. FAUCETTE: So did everything on the QPL.

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Okay. So let’s put that to a
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vote.

MR. HAMIL: Further discussion.

MR. DYKES: Yes, sir.

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

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

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

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

MR. HAMIL: Marc, does DOT still run the
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tests?

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't know that I can answer that. I think there's more to that than just can another lab do our tests. I think what this does, what we've all known it will do, is this will basically put the decision making to these parameters, and that will populate approved products, not the DOT's process.
MR. RUZOWICZ: It takes away the people who are coming with a test from UGA, a test from Wisconsin, and they all got different parameters saying their test is the best. Takes that decision making out of it. Nothing for or against. I don't even know if they have testing facilities that do this stuff but I'm just saying in general.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: I would support that.

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

MR. BEHREND: Could you say a little bit more about what the statistical number might look like, without us having to do math? .045 minus .015?
MR. WATSON: No. It would be -- I mean, you wouldn't want a plus or minus. You're just going to go to the plus side, and I'm guessing it would be a standard deviation to maybe the mean. I don't know if that's -- I would think it should be something like a standard deviation. With the number of data points that we have, it's small enough that a standard deviation is probably the best way to have, you know, what is that upper limit. As opposed to taking one test and saying that that is the upper limit, I think a standard deviation is more statistically defensible to say you're looking at all of the products that were tested, and I think it's pretty close to accepting, when we did it before, it's pretty close to accepting all of the products.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PARKER: That has no relevance
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(inaudible).

MR. WATSON: Yeah.

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: Okay. Other recommendations?

MR. MORAN: The problem with the 10 or 12 products, if you took it off the DOT QPL list right
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here, there's 54 SKUs, whatever you want to call them, on this list. So you took, I assume, 10 or 12, whatever the number, I can't recall right now, so you're going to shut out X number of folks here that are already on the DOT list. Are you going to grandfather them in too and assume that they are at .045 or whatever for the get-go to start out, or are you just going to leave them off and make them catch up, so to speak?

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

MR. WATSON: Yeah. Coming from a large family, I always like to try to be in the middle part. Ideally I think I'd only want to use the data, the products that were tested, but that's going to cause controversy, but I think that every product ultimately needs to have a standard that compares to what is in the book. So if all the other products, the 43 other products or whatever that were not tested, then that could be that three-year clause, that within that three years they have to be tested so as to whether or not they can be put onto the list. They would be grandfathered in for a three-year period until they can
MR. BROWN: That's kind of what I said earlier. I said all the DOT products and the approved products done through the testing should be used for that three-year period, and then during that three-year period, the ones that did not get tested, that they do have to be tested in that period of time. And that doesn't eliminate anyone for three years.

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

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

RUZOWICZ: I'm just thinking out loud, but if I were a manufacturer, something like that, I'd go test something that I would know would lower it so you could play with the numbers. So you need to decide, if you're going to do that, how would you want it to fall before that, because otherwise I'm going to go test the product that is --
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

MS. JORDAN: Let's throw that out.

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: That's a good point.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think it may bear

repeating that in the past, though it's

counterintuitive, the flow rate of conventional Type C
silt fence is greater, so there's less risk of failure
for the whole sediment load behind the fence to reach
that resource. So absent some way to determine what
that risk is across the broad spectrum of products,
you're possibly putting yourselves at some risk to say
you know how that's going to behave today, and we don't.

MR. RUZOWICZ: We could look at it both ways,
you know, with impaired streams and all that kind of
stuff, as far as having to meet different net-flow
metrics put in the units and stuff like that. The
arguments on that go both ways as far as the regulation
side of it.

MR. MASTRONARDI: It does, but at the end the
EPD is going to look at ultimately did you have it
installed and maintained properly. And if it's on the
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list and you've done those things, designed, installed, and maintained, then that's your BMP defense, and there could still be that impact to the resource.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: In the last round of meetings they had briefly talked about that, and one of the
things that they had come up with was that the product had to maintain at least 80 percent of the height. It could either be maintained back to it or it would need to be replaced. So that was one of the things that was put into the manual as far as -- because Adena was always, "How am I going to inspect this? How am I going to --", you know. And they came up with 80 percent of the original height that it had to maintain, be maintained.

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

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

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

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

MR. FAUCETTE: Could you say that again?

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

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

MR. DYKES: Moving forward, right, in three years, that's correct. In three years they need to be
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tested to stay on the list.

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

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

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

MS. JORDAN: For now until we have testing.

MR. MASTRONARDI: But remember, for now is 65 days. So for somebody who has plans in development that have to be done in advance for it to be bid on, my today really is just about today. So we have to really
understand what our contracting industry is going to go
to come January. I just think that's a huge -- I think
if you heard, you thought you heard outcry previously,
my hunch there will be greater outcry, because that's a
very small -- how many silt fence products are in the
nonsensitive right now?

MR. RUZOWICZ: I tend to agree with Marc on
this one. There's a lot of plans already drawn up. I
know you've already got the Type A, B, and C, but it
almost seems kind of like, if there's already
traditional Type C, we're already looking at that data
as a sensitive area, so you guys have talked about a
three-year period. For the sake of all these plans that
are already drawn up and already being used, that
existing Type C could still be used in a sensitive
application. If there's somebody that wants to come
along new in order to make it into that sensitive
application, however you guys come up with the standard
deviation number, that's what they got to meet if
they're not already on that QPL or something. That's
their in. But due to the fact that we got millions of
dollars worth of plans and all different kinds of stuff
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already drawn up six, eight, ten months in advance, I don't even know how far in advance, the likelihood of getting all those changed between today and the end of the year probably isn't very great.

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

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

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

MR. HARRIS: Do we have time to go through 50 manufacturers by January to come up with a list of nonsensitive and sensitive? I mean, this is one of the
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tight spots you get in when you revise a manual for an entire state. It stinks, but you got to start somewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. HARRIS: Could you say that for one year Type C could meet the sensitive areas? Pull Type C into sensitive area silt fence, allow a year to take a larger data set, and next calendar year you better be ready
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MR. BROWN: Even at that there's a lot of DOT projects that were designed ten years ago that are still in the works and they're changing every day due to easements and acquisitions of land and everything else. So either way it changes it's going to be an ongoing process with any project. So if we give that year for Type C approval, then that gives it a full year but it still doesn't cover everything, either way you look at it.

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: Two months is not enough time.

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

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. And I agree.

Eventually the period plays out and it is whatever it is, but I think we just have to be really conscious of that, whatever you decide as a group.
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MR. BROWN: Marc, would you be in agreement upon either a year or a three-year period, like if we've done the others on a three-year basis, just to have that longevity for all of the projects that are ongoing?

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

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

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

MR. DYKES: For that set of plans, the life of that set of plans. However, just as decided by the TAC
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now, there'll be a P Factor number set based on the standard deviation for sensitive and nonsensitive, and Natural Growth or any other vendor will know the number they're shooting for.

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

MR. DYKES: For that set of plans.

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

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: No. They would continuously have to do the alternative BMP process if they choose not to go through whatever process that is set forth for new products to come into the manual. And the alternative BMP process is written into the NPDES BMPs to get into the manual -- not into the manual but onto sites.
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MR. HAMIL: You're saying two and a half years from now, if they're listed on the plans, they're not --

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

MR. HAMIL: For Natural Growth?

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

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

MR. RUZOWICZ: No, no.

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

MR. DYKES: No. He has to go get tested like any other vendor.

MR. HAMIL: Yeah, but the competition gets tested free.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Everybody that got testing through here has to go back and retest. That makes it a hundred percent fair.
MR. HAMIL: For everybody else.

MS. JORDAN: I think that was just a matter of bad timing in how that all played out. The other filter socks that was already an approved product that was in the 5th Edition, it was selected because it was in the 5th Edition. And unfortunately -- this is the way I understand it. The grant came through to do all this testing, and the compost filter socks that you're talking about, they had not been approved in any way. I guess previously the board didn't approve it for whatever criteria they used. Now the point is to have an objective means by which a new product can come into the Green Book, and the process unfortunately sounds like the process with the Natural Growth, it didn't even attempt to try to go through that process until all of this work was begun, and so everything was sort of put in a state of hold. So nothing could come into the Green Book during all that process. It was just a matter of timing, when things happened. So now Natural Growth or any other product can go through the testing procedure. MR. HAMIL: So Natural Growth is a victim of circumstances.
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MS. JORDAN: In effect, yes, unfortunately.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Has Natural Growth gone back and redone their composting testing by any chance?

MR. HAMIL: You talking about --

MR. RUZOWICZ: Just in general.

MR. HAMIL: No. They still got that one good test, the one in California.

MR. FAUCETTE: I think it should be clarified too that basically everything that was tested is probably Natural Growth's competition, not just a single company.

MR. DYKES: Just so that I'm clear on the committee's recommendation, all DOT QPL silt fence products will be listed as nonsensitive and Type C will be sensitive for three years. Are we saying all products have to be tested by the vendor in that three-year period, all products?

MS. JORDAN: Yes, to be fair.

MR. DYKES: I think that's going back to what Mr. Hamil was bringing up.

MR. HAMIL: Next question. Who is going to do the testing?
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MR. RUZOWICZ: All that's specified right now is it's done by a third party.

MS. JORDAN: Any lab that's set up to do these tests.

MR. HAMIL: Y'all have paid TRI to set up the testing facilities. They are the only ones that can compete.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. That was another reason why the committee had gone more closely to 6459 is there's other people that have those slopes already set up that could possibly run this test as well without additional cost.

MR. HAMIL: Where are they?

MR. FAUCETTE: Texas A&M University can do this test, San Diego State University can do the test, a private lab in Wisconsin can do this test.

MR. HAMIL: Is it the same test that TRI is running, the same slopes and everything?

MR. FAUCETTE: Yes. I think University of Central Florida can do this test.

MR. HAMIL: Will they charge $6500 a test too?

MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't know, but if I were
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getting something tested, I would shop around.

MR. DYKES: So all committee members in favor of during the three-year period or by the three-year period, all vendors having to do their own test, irregardless of prior testing paid for through the grant, irregardless of whether you're sensitive or nonsensitive, raise your right hand.

MS. JORDAN: I don't know if I'm ready to vote on that yet.

MR. DYKES: All right.

MR. FAUCETTE: I want to be clear. I think I know, but what you're saying is we're going to do some statistical analysis on the P Factor which could change how some of these items that were tested fit into this category and all future testing. So the items that were tested will fit into one of those two categories more than likely, and then anything that's a Type C on the DOT QPL is automatically approved for the sensitive for three years, and if it's Type A or B it will be nonsensitive for three years.

MR. DYKES: Correct. And now we're saying by the end of that three-year period, in order to remain on
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the list, the question is should all vendors go to the expense of paying for their own test to produce whatever their P Factor for their product.

MR. MORAN: Two of your best silt fence results are not filaments, if you look at the results.

MR. DYKES: Can you expand on that, Bob, what you mean by that?

MR. MORAN: I'm just saying your test results, your two best fences that came up on your P Factor were not a filament silt, were not sensitive, I'm sorry, Type C.

MS. JORDAN: If we were to require everything get retested, even everything that's already contributed to more data, that should eliminate any concerns about Bentonite and whatever else too.

MR. FAUCETTE: Is three years too much time or is that the right amount of time?

MR. BROWN: Three years gives the companies enough time to budget for the testing.

MR. HARRIS: They've got to retest once they test the first time anyway?

MS. JORDAN: It's just a certification letter
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every three years.

MR. HARRIS: Would that not suffice?

MR. FAUCETTE: Bob, you seem uneasy. Are you making a recommendation based on --

MR. MORAN: You're going to base your standard deviation on a fence that is not going to be allowed for sensitive areas.

MR. WATSON: What we were saying is that those that have been tested can fall into the two categories, and then those that were not tested but are on the DOT list, that's where the Type C would go to sensitive and the non-Type C would go to nonsensitive.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So if you're a Type B and you can go get tested tomorrow and you happen to fall in whatever the categorization is that guys set for sensitive, then you can be on the sensitive side sooner than three years, possibly.

MR. DYKES: Ready to vote? More discussion?

MS. JORDAN: I'm a little hesitant to require people that have already had their test done to test again.

MR. HARRIS: Me too. I'm fine with everything.
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except for that. I'm fine with everything else.

MR. WATSON: So the 11 or 12 that were done, you don't think they should have to be retested, but the 40 remaining number should be tested.

MS. JORDAN: There's a bit of unfairness, I think, either way we go. On the one hand it seems unfair to make these vendors go through the expense of getting something tested that's already been tested and and we say we're comfortable with the results. But on the other hand, I see the argument too that there are products that were selected for testing and they've got to go spend the money now, and they say, "They didn't have to spend money. Why do I have to spend money?"

MR. WATSON: The whole goal is to have these products meet the performance criteria, and some of them don't have the numerics to back up the performance criteria. There's not going to be one way that makes everybody happy.

MR. DYKES: Let's vote.

MR. MORAN: Make you happy.

MR. DYKES: Not going to make me happy.

Welcome to public policy. All those in favor of
requiring all silt fence products or Sd1 products to be
tested within a three-year period to remain on the
sensitive or nonsensitive list based on the new P Factor
raise your right hand. Those in opposition? Okay. All
will be retested within the three years, or tested.

MS. JORDAN: Now, we just voted on the Type C
silt fence. That was not all products, right?

MR. DYKES: All sediment barriers, A, B, and
C, currently, sensitive and nonsensitive. Any other
comments on silt fence or sediment barriers or other
products considered sediment barriers?

(No response)

MR. DYKES: Let's take a ten-minute break and
come back at 3:00.

(Recess)

MR. DYKES: We'll reconvene. We're going to
continue moving through the list. The next major
revision was related to inlet sediment traps, and that's
on Page 199 in Chapter 6. There was some performance
criteria added in. Ben, you want to talk a little bit
about that?

MR. RUZOWICZ: The performance criteria for
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inlet sediment traps was ASTM 7351. Basically it was modified to run both paved and unpaved applications per that sediment trap. In talking about this using this existing ASTM, they felt basically with how it mixed the sediment up into a water concentrate basically and put it down into a pipe made it more of an application as far as an inlet trap would be put in in the field, the idea of having both a paved and nonpaved application for those two different applications. The numbers were determined off the BMPs that we had tested allowing for both high flow and high retention and also giving the designer the option to allow a different kind of inlet protection if they needed due to some kind of threat of loss of life or something like that, almost the same basically kind of what it reads in the NPDES negative effects. I forget exactly how it says it.

"In areas where BMPs are being used on paved surfaces or safety is a concern, the potential negative effects of ponding should be taken into account. In such cases a high flow BMP is preferred."

MR. DYKES: Questions or comments or proposed changes for inlet sediment traps?
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MR. PARKER: Any public comments on that?

MR. RUZOWICZ: There was just a paper put here by Hanes Geo. I haven't had time to read through the whole thing. I don't know if there's something in there as far as inlets is concerned. As far as inlets from the existing comments that we had prior to today, there are some generic comments as far as the RUSLE equation as far as just performance standards in general. There are people that feel we should go back to the existing edition of the manual, which would put it back to the way the inlet sediment trap was, so Pages 6-199 to 6-208, inlet sediment traps, should be deleted and replaced with Pages 6-139 to 6-144, inlet sediment trap attached from the 5th Edition. So all those comments to go back traditional to the 5th Edition, and that's pretty much with all the BMPs that we've talked about today as far as some recommendations for the manual.

MS. JORDAN: Leave it as is.

MR. DYKES: Any proposed changes? Seeing none, approved as presented. The next one is revised retrofit adding a silt control gate.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically what this does is it
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takes what the DOT is already using with the silt gate and lets it be used for any purpose, not just infrastructure use only, but it could be used on a common development or a stand-alone application. So before the silt gate was only being used in infrastructure practices; now it would be allowed for common development and stand-alone. It's there for an option for all the permittees.

MR. DYKES: Have we had any comments on it to this point?

MR. RUZOWICZ: We haven't received any comments on it.

MR. DYKES: That's on Page 182, Chapter 6. Any comments? Seeing none, it's agreed to as presented. Turning to the back of the page, a list of changes in the 6 Edition. The following BMPs have been added: A section on flocculants and coagulants, which is on Page 109.

MR. DYKES: Basically what this does is it goes back to the polyacrylamide where polyacrylamide can be used as both a flocculant and coagulant or a tackifier binder depending on its application.
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

Basically we don't want somebody with a flocc block trying to tack down straw with a flocc block on the middle of their slope. That's not the right application. So that's one of the things that brought into question do we need to split it up, and that's where the discussion came that polyacrylamide could be both a tackifier binder and a flocculant and coagulant, so we would have two different categories so that people looked at it correctly.

MR. DYKES: No comments to date, I don't think. Any proposed changes? Seeing none, agreed to.

Surface skimmers, a new practice added.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically right before, nine, eight months before we finished the new NPDES permits run-through, they specified that dewatering from the top had to be done. We looked around. The one thing that we could find was skimmers that were out there. The biggest comments I'm getting from this is that we're making people buy skimmers. We're not telling them that they have to use a skimmer; we're just telling them that the requirement from the EPA handed down to us under 40 CFR says that they have to dewater from the top. The
option that we were able to put into the manual was a skimmer. If they can come up with another way, they are more than welcome to use that way.

Mr. Dykes: So there's a sizing table that's been added for skimmers.

Mr. Rurowicz: Yeah. Basically there is a piece in the manual which basically says if you have a skimmer -- I'm giving you the short part on this, but basically you need to prove that your skimmer actually dewater at the rate it says it's going to dewater. Originally the group had thought, okay, this is something as easy as anybody can go, get some PVC, drill some holes, and make it flow the right way. Well, it's not that simple. It needs to have the right buoyancy. It needs to float just below the surface so it's not sucking all the stuff off the top. There's a lot of different calculations, orifice and head size, stuff like that, that goes into account to make these things work properly. So this test just basically checks to make sure that it does what it says it's supposed to do. That's all it is. There's not necessarily an approved products list with it or anything like that. It's just
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something for engineers to go by when they are selecting
a skimmer as to what they need to look for when they're
specifying.

MR. DYKES: Any comments, questions? Seeing
none, it's agreed to. Temporary sediment trap, Sd4.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Basically with the Sd4, the
NPDES permits specify that individual lots have to have
sediment storage, and sometimes you can have a lot
that's as small as a quarter of an acre, maybe even
smaller if you're within a common development. They
were wanting other forms of ways to come up with
sediment storage than just your traditional Sd3 or
retrofit because they needed other applications for
their small sites. So in looking around, the committee
had come up with this detail from, I believe, Knoxville,
Tennessee, and liked what they were seeing and decided
they wanted that in the manual as an option for sediment
storage for those smaller sites.

MR. DYKES: That's on Page 237. Any
comments? Seeing none, agreed. Slope stabilization
we've already discussed. Seep berm, a new BMP that was
also added.
MR. RUZOWICZ: With this one basically there was a lot of work done in existing studies from the original TAPC, which I believe started at around 2000 or something like that. There were studies done in dirt one and dirt two techniques by Dr. Richard Warner, I think out of Kentucky. I might have the area wrong. But they did some studies here in Georgia, as well as some other states, on seep berms and their effectiveness, and from there the generic BMP of the seep berm was put into the manual to allow for the two-year, 24-hour flow to seep through the berm while allowing larger discharges to go through intermediate dykes flowing into a sediment storage area. I don't know if I'm saying that a hundred percent correctly, but it has to flow to some kind of area. The exact wording is in the manual.

MR. DYKES: On Page 249.

MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the things about the seep berm is that it could be allowed to be left in place to be utilized as a walking trail for the future. It doesn't necessarily have to be taken out, but it still has to meet the definition of final stabilization
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and all that stuff as far as the 70 percent density with a hundred percent stabilization. Same as the NPDES permits.

MR. DYKES: Seeing none, it's agree to.

Turbidity curtain is an additional practice, new practice, Page 271.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So the turbidity curtain basically was not to do away with any of the existing practices that people are using; it's just put in there as an option for people to use if they are working within the flow of water or on a stream buffer restoration project. It doesn't stop them from having to get the necessary permits or variances, but it could also be used in applications in sediment ponds and stuff like that where maybe you would want to use it as a forebay or something like that where you don't have the traditional state water as well. Just another option for designers to use if it were to be used, and it has all the stuff in there to say that you have to go through all the necessary permits and variances in order to use it if you are using it in state waters or in a buffer.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Originally we didn't have a write-up for this in our manual. Through public comment we had gotten a bunch of comments that trees conserve soil and water and all that other kind of stuff, that we need to add tree protection to it. In doing that, we went back and looked, and Savannah had a pretty stringent tree ordinance, and worked with some other people and got a generic write-up that if somebody chooses to use this as a BMP, they can use it; if they choose not, they don't have to.

MR. DYKES: Any discussion? Seeing none, it's agreed to. That completes all the new practices and changes from the 5th Edition to the 6th that we've gone through. Is there any other discussion matters as it relates to the manual? I'm committed to giving you a second go at it if there's something that concerns you.

MR. RUZOWICZ: One of the comments that we had received is that brush barriers was a new BMP that was added into the manual, and that was previously there in
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the 5th Edition. It wasn't anything that we made up or added new. We were just taking what was in the existing 5th Edition.

MR. DYKES: Any other discussion on this manual?

MR. FAUCETTE: Related to the statistical analysis of the P Factor we should probably put a time frame on when that will be done, discussed, or permitted or whatever.

MS. JORDAN: It won't take that long to do.

MR. DYKES: We'll work with the proper folks to get it done. That's a small matter compared to the other matters. Any other comments? Okay, Item 4, discussion on comments or issues expressed to date through the public comment period regarding the BMP testing methods or testing results. Is there any matters that we haven't discussed today or that we have discussed regarding the testing or the results that committee members would like to bring forward? Anything else?

Seeing nothing, we'll move to Item 5, consideration and discussion on third-party review of
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BMP testing methods and testing results. Comments from the committee on a third-party review?

MS. JORDAN: No. I think we've hashed that out pretty thoroughly.

MR. DYKES: Anybody else? Okay. All right. We'll move to public comment. We'll go straight down the list as signed up. First on the list is Robert Page, C-POP Systems.

MR. PAGE: I just wanted clarification on what can and can't be used on the sediment barriers. I got lost in the Type A, Type C, Type B, compost sock. I kind of got lost.

MS. JORDAN: Everything that was tested is approved for both sensitive and nonsensitive applications. Everything that's on the DOT qualified product list is approved for a period of three years as nonsensitive with the exception of Type C silt fence, which is approved for three years for sensitive and nonsensitive applications.

MR. PAGE: So will you put like Type A in a sensitive application for three years or not?

MS. JORDAN: Only if it was one of the tested
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products.

MR. FAUCETTE: If it met the criteria.

MS. JORDAN: Yes. We haven't done the calculation yet based on the --

MR. PAGE: Some of Type A products that were tested did not have a backing or did not have a proper size post, according to the sensitive specs that I saw. Spacing was off a couple of feet. And I was just wondering, if I sell a product, if someone asks for a roll of C-POP, which is this cost, and a roll of Type A, which is this cost, are they allowed, being as a roll of Type A was tested during this test on 6-foot centers, I would assume with an inch-and-a-half post, are they allowed to buy that product to put in a sensitive area or are they still required to go with the traditional Type C method, whether it be a C system or wire back or 4-foot centers? Because to my knowledge, and I don't know if Mr. Moran can answer this, but any of the Type A's, from what I saw they were tested on 6-foot centers, not 4-foot centers. When a customer comes in and wants to purchase product, I want to be able to give them what they are asking for, and I want to know that I'm not
TAC MEETING, OCTOBER 28, 2014

going to get my customers in trouble by selling them the incorrect product. So can Type A centers with no support on inch-and-a-half posts go in a sensitive area? That is what it is currently approved for.

MR. DYKES: As listed in the manual it has to be on 4-foot centers to be in a sensitive application.
So 6-foot would not work.

MR. PAGE: That's the way it was tested. That's the confusing part to me. I've heard two different ways that products that were tested are allowed, but yet Type C is allowed for three years. And I just want to get it correct, because Type A, though it passed the P Factor that was set at the .03, it was not tested properly because of the spacing and the post size, from what I see. And the only products that were tested for sensitive measures should have been on 4-foot centers. And I don't think any of the Type A's were tested on 4-foot centers with a 2-by-2. I just want to, here again, before I sell a roll of silt fence to my customer, I want to be able to say if it fails and lo and behold it dumps whatever, that I can tell them who to go see about being told that it got put there.
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Because I'm very confused after today. I'm lost.

MS. JORDAN: It needs to be installed according to the Green Book for a sensitive application.

MR. PAGE: So the test does not hold any weight according to the sensitive/nonsensitive, being as it was not tested that way. That's my point. I've heard that the test applies, but then on the flip side I've heard Type C applies. I can't see how it can be both, because the products were not tested exactly the way they are going to be implemented in the field, that I understand.

I'm not an engineer. I'm not anything. I'm just a reseller and I want to get clarification. My business is C-POP and that's what I do, and I sell all erosion control supplies. And I want to know when my customer comes in, if I sell product to him, am I going to be required to put stakes, if they were on 2-foot centers during the slope study, or 4-foot centers in the book. I need to know how to tell my client how to install his product or my product or the Type A product properly, because there's two different things, I mean, when you look at the videos on the slope study that's
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tested on 2-, or 3-, or whatever foot centers but the
book says a minimum of 4-foot, I believe, or maximum of
4-foot.

I don't know, and there might be some
contractors available, I don't know of any contractors
that will go from a 4-foot center to a 2-foot center
just because they think otherwise. I mean, I don't know
anyone that would double up on their cost like that.
There might be. I don't know. But it was tested, silt
fence products were tested in accordance to the way they
were built or the manufacturer's whatever, 4-foot,
6-foot. The stake sizes were the same. And then you
get into the filter logs and it appears that the stakes
were a little closer together, and in the checkdam they
were a little closer together. I just want
clarification so if my customer comes in, do we install
them according to the way they were tested or the way
the book says?

MR. WATSON: The way the book says.

MR. PAGE: Okay. The way the book says.

MR. RUZOWICZ: The book says both, because you
guys have said that you're going to add a specification
in there that says per manufacturer's recommendation.
So the book is a recommendation, but if they can test
another way and prove that their product is going to
still perform by having a bigger post spacing, then
what? Then I guess that would be okay.

FROM THE FLOOR: Or smaller.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Or smaller. The thing that's
in there is that it has to maintain 80 percent of its
original height. If you think your product can make it
for that person for whatever duration they're buying it,
you know, depending on how they test. If it's fair for
one, it's fair for all. That's all I'm saying. If one
person gets it, then everybody else should get it the
same way. The book is a recommendation, but if they
choose to test another way and do it another way because
they can, then they should have the same ability that a
compost filter sock or whoever else has to do their
stuff.

MR. PAGE: Ben, I'm talking about right now,
not going back and testing. I'm talking about today.
Right now with what we've done today, this very moment,
if I have a customer walk in the door and I'm going to
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sell them a roll of C Systems, I'm going to sell them a compost filter log, or I'm going to sell them a roll of Type A, and I'm going to put it on the edge of the Chattahoochee, I want to know, whether it goes from $500 to $200 to $50, am I allowed to sell them all three of them, or is it just one, or is it two of them? Do you have to put your stakes on 4-foot centers? Are you requiring to go on 2-foot centers because that's the way certain products were tested?

MR. RUZOWICZ: From what I've been hearing is the traditional type, the A, B, and C silt fence, since they're getting grandfathered in, would continue to use the specifications for that three-year period. If they are retested per that test, then it would be per the manufacturer's installation guidelines, however they were able to meet that number.

MR. FAUCETTE: For that test.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes. For whatever test it is that they chose to run. People all the time come with products to DOT or us and whoever, I mean, a lot of times they tell us they have a specific product and they're the only one in that category. Well, the
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reality of it is they probably fit in one of these
different categories somehow or another that we've been
talking about today.

MR. PAGE: Here again, I want my question
answered. I mean, listen. Can I use a roll of Type A
on a sensitive area effective when we leave here or when
the rules are changed or whatever? Is Type A allowed in
sensitive areas? The reason I'm asking, I can see I'm
going frustrated, but the reason I'm concerned about
this is I've heard that we're going to go by the test,
and then I've heard we're going to go by the three-year
thing. I want to know whether we're going by the
testing, the way it was tested, which Type A passed.

MR. RUZOWICZ: What they allowed is both for
that three-year period.

MR. PAGE: Okay. So for the three-year period
we can use Type A in sensitive areas or nonsensitive
areas as well as Type C. That's what I just heard.

MR. RUZOWICZ: If they had run that test.

MS. JORDAN: Was your Type A product one of
the tested products?

MR. PAGE: No. I don't make fabric.
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MR. WATSON: The products that you're describing, were they one of the ones that were tested?

MR. PAGE: I believe Mr. Moran's product was tested, Beltech. I think it was a Type A and a Type B that was passed. If I'm not mistaken either one or both passed sensitive. I can't remember. Maybe he can answer.

MR. MORAN: Yeah, it did.

MR. PAGE: I think Mr. Booth also had a Type A that passed sensitive and another one that did not pass sensitive. I believe Mr. Moran just said yes, it did, so his is a perfect example. He has a product that was approved with the testing as a sensitive style silt fence on 6-foot centers, and that's the way it was tested and it was approved for sensitive. Can I sell it for sensitive uses without any support mechanisms behind it and just sell it as a roll of Type A, which is the old way, which would now be a sensitive style silt fence if somebody came in and wanted to buy it?

MR. FAUCETTE: If I understand correctly, I think the answer is yes, if you're talking about that product that was tested. Not any A product.
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MR. WATSON: Not generic Type A. But talking about that particular product the way that it was set up, if that's the manufacturer's specifications, then yes, you could.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Did the committee decide that everybody has to go back and retest?

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think what I'm hearing too, though, the biggest point of what I'm hearing is the manual now says for sensitive it's a 4-foot spacing, yet the results of what was tested is a 6-foot spacing. And it goes back to what I tried to say earlier in terms of remember why those were different. You didn't want the whole fence failing and that sediment load going into the resource. Type A, if it's approved, Type A retains more water. It's got a slower flow rate. I think --

MR. PARKER: We haven't approved Type A.

MR. MASTRONARDI: We have, even for a sensitive area. Historically that never would have been in a sensitive area.

MR. PARKER: But we've only approved the ones that were tested for sensitive areas.
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MR. MASTRONARDI: Right.

MR. PARKER: So they're not Type A. It was a Type A but now it's not Type A; it's a sensitive area silt fence.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Fair enough. Broadly speaking it's a fabric on posts and (Inaudible). To his question, though, are those three that he mentioned, C, nonsensitive, sensitive, and again, a compost filter sock installation, any of the three are suitable to be installed along the Chattahoochee. I think today that's what this says. The question would be how you articulate for January how short that list is, in the practical sense of it. I don't know how many Type A products were tested. Off the top of my head I don't know that number.

MR. RUZOWICZ: For January we have everything that's in the existing Type C category.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. The other part I'm sensitive to, because we work in a low-bid environment, if that wire backing and that labor to install and attach that wire backing is more than just a roll of A on post, then A is going to go up. Predominantly that's
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what's going to go up. Cost will drive it. Even though C-POP is competitive to the wire backing, A is still cheaper than those. If compost filter sock is cheaper yet, that's going to go up. That would be the item that gets used. I think the question is fair. It's nothing more than are we all aware that that's what we're doing.

MR. DYKES: The detail on Page 194 says sensitive has to have some type of backing, if it's a silt fence, on Page 194.

MR. MASTRONARDI: So maybe those manufacturers that see their product need to understand it has additional requirements?

MR. DYKES: I think that's what we're discussing. The schematic as presented shows a backing. Woven wire fence or alternative backing of a silt fence is type sensitive.

MR. PAGE: What is the alternative backing?

MR. DYKES: It just says alternative backing. It could be made of --

MR. PAGE: It would go back through the retesting process, I guess, because as far as Type A's go, and here again I might be incorrect, I don't think I
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am, but I do not believe there were any Type A or B fabrics tested on a 4-foot center with any type of support mechanism behind it, whether it be wire or on alternative backing, nor were any of them tested with a 2-by-2 post, which is also in the specifications. They were all tested according to the old method, which was A, B, C. That's the only thing that I'm wanting to be very clear on for me.

Just like Marc just mentioned, Type A is the lower price of everything in my world, in the silt fence world. Compost sock, I don't really know, but Type A, especially without backing and the smaller posts on the centers that it was tested on, is considerably cheaper than the product I currently make. And I want to make sure that when they come and they typically, and I'm just speaking as of today, would call in an order for ten pallets of C-POP, now am I allowed to give them five pallets of Type A at a third the price with no backing? That's the way it was tested. That's the part I'm confused about.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the point is we're no longer looking at the test in terms of other than
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saying it established the factor. The manual does say, to Brent's point, it doesn't define a post dimension but it does define it has to have a backing system. That being the case, it does sound like those products wouldn't be able to go out today without additional testing.

MR. RUZOWICZ: What I see for post sizing, it has it on 6-197.

MR. PAGE: What does it say, Ben?

MR. RUZOWICZ: It says nonsensitive should be 1.5 by 1.5, 1.3 pounds per foot, 3-inch diameter or a 2-by-4, and that sensitive shall be 1.3 pounds per foot minimum and a 2-by-2.

MR. PAGE: And that's the part I want. I understand where we are with this. If it was not tested according to the way the book says, am I now required, if I sell a roll of Mr. Moran's fence, to attach some form of backing and reduce the spacing to 4-foot and put a 2-by-2 on it before I'm allowed to sell it?

MR. DYKES: Yes.

MR. PAGE: Am I required to have it retested prior to using it?
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MS. JORDAN: Not within the next three years.

MR. DYKES: By the end of three years.

MS. JORDAN: By the end of three years it does have to be retested, but you can use the designated type post size and you can add the backing to Type A, and for the next three years you can use that.

MR. PAGE: So the backing that I'm currently using for my product, is it an approved alternative backing where I can put it on a piece of Type A that was passed and sell the product? It was used in some of the Type C testing through the C Systems. So when it breaks down to where you either have to have a wire behind it or the, I don't remember the word, alternative, approved alternative backing, the backing that I currently use on my products, what I'm hearing, is I can take my backing and put it on a piece of Type A that was approved or Type B that was approved, bring the spacings where they're supposed to be, and it is automatically an approved product. And then over the course of the next 36 months I'm required to go have it tested. Is that correct?

MR. MASTRONARDI: That sounds right.
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MR. PAGE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I just want to say one thing.

From the last meeting there was a public comment that was made to change the specification on post size from 1.3 to 1.15 pounds per foot to match what the DOT had changed theirs to, and everybody had decided that that was good. And I said what was in the manual, but through the public comments sheet that I've got here that change is supposed to be made to the specification, 1.15 pounds per foot.

MR. DYKES: Instead of 1.3.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

MR. DYKES: Next comment, Mr. Don Davis.

MR. DAVIS: Snooky touched on something I was going to talk about, but my thing is the DOT, they want a certain strength. They want AOS's water flows to be a certain thing. Are we going to change -- I mean, it has to be a mano mano. Can we change to a tape tape, I mean, make it as weak as we want? I don't understand some things that's going on, but like the Type A can pass. Does it still have to be a mano tape? Is that taken out of the drawings? Can we use a tape tape? I
mean, all we have to do is pass that test is what y'all are saying? I've been in the silt fence business for a long time. Y'all are leaving yourself up for some bad things: 60 gram, 50 gram, cheap. You went away from your strengths, everything. Just pass the test.

Anybody got a clue? Bob, am I wrong?

MR. MORAN: I thought there was a strength requirement.

MR. DAVIS: I thought all we have to do is pass the test is what we heard today. That's what we just heard a minute ago.

MR. RUZOWICZ: We had discussed this in the last previous --

MR. DAVIS: Just a minute ago you said all we have to do is pass that test.

MR. RUZOWICZ: In the previous meetings or times before this we had talked about this and having a specification for just silt fence to have a strength test and then not having it for a compost filter sock, because they don't have the same index properties or something like that. How fair is that? We've gone around and around about that. That's why they went back
in there and put that has to be maintain 80 percent of
the height. It wasn't any individual specifications
other than we're taking index properties (Inaudible).

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think the concern is where
the department may still maintain a certain number of
specs that we would require, if there's nothing else
said elsewhere, it would simply be pass the test, the
concern being the product may be cheapened over time.

MR. DAVIS: Type C was made for safety, if I
recall right, because you got a high water flow and you
got traffic on the highways. If you back up traffic
using a tape tape and the water gets out there, someone
gets in a wreck, who is responsible for that?

MR. RUZOWICZ: Silt fence, as far as I know,
should be placed in sheet flow applications.

MR. DAVIS: What about DOT applications?

MR. RUZOWICZ: They should be placing their
silt fence in sheet flow applications. If they're using
it for an inlet protection, that's a different story.
That's why there's parameters set forth for allowing
different things or possibly not even having it at all.

MR. DAVIS: But you just said if we could pass
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the test, we could use it for sensitive, all we have to do is pass that test.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right.

MR. DAVIS: So are we going to be allowed to use it on a sensitive area on the highway?

MR. RUZOWICZ: You're talking about ponding.

I'm just saying if you're using it as sheet flow application, you're not going to have a concentrated flow.

MR. DAVIS: Am I right on that, Marc?

MR. MASTRONARDI: You are. Your concerns are valid concerns. I think the challenge to everybody is whether or not you know today what those risks are, how big they are.

MR. DAVIS: My other thing is silt fence could be modified to what you guys want, and we're taking a test that costs $6500. We can make a silt fence the way you want it, the water flow you want. Maybe it's not 70, because that's what y'all wanted us to meet was the 70 water flow. We can lower that, tweak it, and you guys can do the test and see if it does the results.

Give us the results you want and we can make a fabric to
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match up to where you're at, what you want, instead of every silt fence company catered to a new product. I mean, that seems like what we're doing right now. The silt fence industry is catering to new products. You can actually do your test one time and make us in an envelope per se. Take the water flow, the AOS's that you want. We all do the same. All our fabrics are made the same. They have to be mano mano, mano tape, whatever, instead of every company single doing a $6500 test. That's just ridiculous to me. That's all I've got.

MR. DYKES: Next, Kelli Davis.

MS. DAVIS: The first thing I wanted to talk about was the checkdams. When you guys first brought it up, you talked about there really weren't that many issues with it. There were some issues that were brought up in the past that I wanted to kind of mention to you. On the rock and stone checkdams, it was brought up that in the test we used an 8-ounce nonwoven fabric. Currently Georgia DOT would probably fail you if you used an 8-ounce nonwoven fabric. How do you address that? How does the community move forward with that?
Do you use a typical riprap fabric that has been being
used by the Georgia DOT or do you go with what your
recommendation says or what your test was, and it was
8-ounce nonwoven? We really need clarification on that
because we do get requests for that in our industry a
lot, and you guys need to make that decision for us, let
us know what is acceptable, what is not acceptable, will
our product pass for the DOT if the Green Book says
something different.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Are you referring to the fabric
that goes under the rock?

MS. DAVIS: Correct. You guys used an 8-ounce
nonwoven fabric in the test. I believe Joel said it
when he had it up on his film, I think it was in
September, that that was just an oversight.

MR. RUZOWICZ: The manual specifies AASHTO
M288. As far as I know M288 allows both woven and
nonwoven fabric.

MS. DAVIS: But Georgia DOT does not.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. We're not Georgia DOT.

I mean, I'm just saying we've had that specification in
there for a while.
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MS. DAVIS: From what I understand by the code in Georgia, Georgia Soil and Water determines what Georgia DOT will do or will accept, so you guys do have a pretty important role in this as far as Georgia DOT goes. We kind of need to know how do we direct our customers on that. They call up and they say I need riprap fabric. That's what they tell us. A lot of contractors may not know, but we as a person, a company who sells the product, we need to know what's going to pass for Georgia DOT and what's going to pass for Georgia Soil and Water. Is it one and the same? Is it something totally different?

MR. RUZOWICZ: The DOT, like every local issuing authority, has the ability to be more stringent. I think in this case that might be the case where the DOT has a more stringent requirement than what the traditional AASHTO M288 specification has in it.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. And another question on the checkdam application. Hay bales were rejected. I think you came up with a better installation method and it worked. Silt fence was installed as far as a Type W application. I would like to see, if there is going to
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be any type of retest, if we could retest C and B applications. I know it depends on the channels, but if there can be an adjustment made for a blowout, I think there should be an adjustment made in the design, in the installed application design. Is that a problem with any of you?

MR. DYKES: I think the commission would look to the DOT for a recommendation what to do there. The only reason we tested that energy dissipator was because DOT requested it to be done. If the DOT wants to test it in a different way, we'll let the DOT.

MS. DAVIS: Well, again, in Georgia code Georgia Soil and Water tells Georgia DOT what to do, and as soon as this test was done, this application was yanked completely, whether it was W shaped or V shaped, from the state of Georgia as far as silt fence being used in that application. We got the letter that went out all through the state. All the contractors got it. And it's very confusing to us as a manufacturer if you install it in one way and it actually encompasses all applications. Am I saying that where you can understand what I'm saying?
MR. DYKES: I understand, but that was an issue between DOT and EPD and they'll need to answer that. That wasn't a commission letter.

MS. DAVIS: All right. Another thing. Ben, you suggested that blowouts should not be taken into consideration. Did I understand that correctly?

MR. RUZOWICZ: Yes. You had brought it up, other people had brought it up, that the definition of a blowout wasn't defined.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. From other testing labs, not just TRI, but I'm saying from other testing labs out there, typically if there's a blowout, there's a product failure or installation failure, and either way it needs to be addressed. So it shouldn't be eliminated. It should be taken into consideration. If it's an installation error, typically the testing lab, from what I've been told, will stop the process, fix their installation error, repack the dirt or whatever it requires to start the test over, and redo it. It would be on their dime because it's their installation issue.

But if it's a product failure, that needs to also be identified, because if it doesn't work acceptable on a
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test plot, how do you expect it to work on a real-world application? Those are my thoughts on that, and I'd like some input if you don't mind to help me understand that.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I think, as I understand that, it would be a matter of the material that passes through that blowout, so to speak, would likely be what leads to its failure. Rather than stopping the test and saying there's no way it's going to pass, actually let it perform and see what that is. That's my understanding of what in fact determines what that would do to continue a test.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Even if it does, I mean, the number is going to tell us stuff, regardless of what happens, without having to define it.

MR. MASTRONARDI: But I think the question being do we mean that -- I mean, is it okay if a product fails or blows out? I'm sitting in the seat of that's the product, that was us that it blew out, and we didn't get any more test data from it as a silt fence checkdam.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I'm going off memory. From what I remember it was around point, around 55 or
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something like that, even blowing out and redoing it. I
don't know if I'm right. I know the first couple of
times it was over a hundred, but I don't know that a
blowout would be able to meet the 30 percent.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. But is the take-away
for the industry that it's not that there is no
recognition of the blowout; it's that those test results
will demonstrate the number? Is that what we're saying?

Demonstrate pass/fail.

MR. RUZOWICZ: That was my thought, that those
results would demonstrate pass or fail.

MR. MASTRONARDI: The likelihood that you have
a blowout and it's going to pass, I don't know that.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I don't know either. I was
just trying to think of a way, you know, everybody had a
problem with it, to come up with another way.

MS. DAVIS: Excuse me for interrupting, but if
the other testing labs in the industry recognize a
blowout as a failure and this particular committee
chooses to not recognize a blowout as a failure, then
we're not apples to apples here. So when our company,
who is based out of the state of Georgia and we hire
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Georgia people and we work in Georgia for Georgia and we are pushing for Georgia to be a great state in this thing, if we try to put a product, the same product in Georgia in another state, per se, using the same criteria, we are probably going to fail. If it's tested apples to apples, then you know that you're getting the same thing. But if you're testing one way in one state and you're expecting that product to do well everywhere -- Georgia has just got to make up its mind, I think. I think that's the thing. This is a pretty serious deal in our industry, and it's not just our industry. It's actually statewide. I don't want to see anybody's product fail. I don't. I really don't. But if you're going to test it, it needs to have something that people can actually follow and understand in every testing lab. If the testing lab says blowouts don't matter or if this technical committee says blowouts don't matter that every other testing lab in the nation says it does, what are you saying for the state of Georgia?

I can move on to the next thing I have. Type A and Type B silt fence are the same construction. One is taller; one is shorter. Is that right, Bob?
MR. MORAN: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: If you test Type B silt fence or if you test Type A silt fence, would it not automatically qualify for the same thing as Type B?

MR. MORAN: It wouldn't qualify because it's not the same type.

MS. DAVIS: If you tested Type B in this type of testing and it passed, my thoughts are, and I may be wrong on this, but my thoughts are that if you test Type B and it passes, would not Type A also pass?

MR. MORAN: It shouldn't.

MS. DAVIS: And then you would only have to test one fabric versus two, but you would qualify for both A and B application. That's just a thought. You guys can talk about that.

You said there would be a cert letter that would have to be submitted in the three-year period. Is that cert letter going to be going for Georgia Soil and Water or is it going to be going to NTPEP? Because from what I understand, you're moving towards being a NTPEP member state as far as following their criteria. So we'd have to be audited by currently TRI, and they would
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determine whether or not we pass or fail the audit. But would our cert letter be contingent upon that type of audit from TRI or whoever the current testing lab is at that time for NTPEP, or does the cert letter just go directly to Georgia Soil and Water and say we are self-certifying that we do meet your criteria and have not changed our application?

MR. RUZOWICZ: From what I know for the test method, we just specified third party. It didn't say that it had to be through that test.

MS. DAVIS: Who are you certifying to?

MR. DYKES: The commission.

MS. DAVIS: Are you going to wire NTPEP?

MR. DYKES: We're just saying approved lab. That's all it says to this point.

MS. DAVIS: Are the university systems going to be included in that?

MR. DYKES: If they can prove they're an approved lab, yes.

MS. DAVIS: Would they have to certify through Georgia Soil and Water for that, or the national program?
MR. DYKES: It wouldn't be certified through us because we don't certify testing entities.

MS. DAVIS: All right. In the report, the final TRI report that was published back in 2012, it states in the scope of the testing where it breaks down in the back of the report, where it breaks down sediment barrier testing and it breaks down the channel testing, it tells what's being followed, what test method is being followed, and it does reflect ASTM WK 11340 in that, in the very front page. I know today we said we're doing a modified version of that, but that is what the test method is reflecting in the report itself. From what I saw, it doesn't say modified. It says ASTM WK 11340, which, as I understand it, is a working test method that's been in process for about 12 years with ASTM. For Georgia to change its whole everything and based on these test methods, for ASTM to have been working on it for 12 years and it not have been passed yet, that's kind of a scary thing because you're basing it on something that's not truly been proven science. They're still working on it. That's what the WK stands for. So I would like you guys to consider that as well.
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We talked about the Bentonite, and the test itself says that we are trying to determine these products, determine a benchmark for these products based off of real-world applications, if I'm correct. Bentonite is typically not used in the field, whether it's on filter socks or whether it's on silt fence. So if we install as per the test, then that means everybody that puts in silt fence will be spreading Bentonite at the bottom. Everybody who puts in a filter log or compost log will be spreading Bentonite at the bottom, because you'll get the same applications. If you say it doesn't really make a difference, it does make a difference, because if you noticed during the blowouts the lady was continuously trying to fill the hole, to plug up the hole where the blowouts were occurring. It's a sealant. It swells. It blocks. So to say that it doesn't matter is not an actually correct statement, in my interpretation, because as a sealant, if you're blocking any type of flow, then you're altering your test. You're making that part of the application. So are we going to apply the Bentonite --

FROM THE FLOOR: Why don't you test without
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the Bentonite?

MS. DAVIS: I think the first nine products were tested without the Bentonite; the last four products tested were with the Bentonite. If you're going to say you're not testing it for one, then why are you testing it with the other?

FROM THE FLOOR: You have to go to the test facility to understand that. Installation is important to make the test work just to get data. So go up there and test it. Just take a crew up there and get it tested. That's silly. I'm sorry. You hear it over and over again. Testing, you have to get data. You have to install certain ways.

MS. DAVIS: The very first test, if I may, if you don't mind, the very first test that was done, the very first series of tests that was done, the testing lab said on video we will not be using that Bentonite stuff anymore. They said it. I didn't say that. So we are wondering why was it re-added. I'm okay if they want to test every single person's product with the Bentonite, that's fine because we'll all get the same type of results. But if you don't and you're trying to
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tell everybody to base it off of real-world
applications, that's not real world. That is our point.
I'm just saying it.

There's repeatability issues. As Mr. Page
brought up a while ago, Mr. Larry Booth of Willagoochie
Industrial Fabrics makes a lot of geotextile for across
the industry. He had two series of Type A products that
were tested within this test. One passed and one
failed. The repeatability is not something that has
been proven with this test method. Again, we ask you to
reconsider using any results from this 11340 test based
off of all the repeatability issues that have been
brought up. But you cannot tell one manufacturer you've
got this same product and it passed here and it failed
here. That is such confusion. It basically looks like
you are picking winners and losers.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So what you're saying is the
same product was installed twice but got different
results.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. RUZOWICZ: I think one of the things that
they showed is that those products had different
flow-through rates so they weren't exactly made the same
and had different index properties. So it showed they
weren't exactly the same product to start with.

MS. DAVIS: The index properties, I would kind
of beg to differ a little bit, because our product was
also tested with index properties along with another
product. We both got different test results. And I
called Sam Allen out of TRI a few months back and I
asked him, I said, "If you're going to test our product
and it's a fully assembled product that's got the
netting on the back, how would you test it?" And he
said, "We would prefer to receive it without the
netting." And I said, "But if we sent it in and it was
fully assembled, how would you test it?" And he said,
"We would cut the netting off." So any type of error,
any type of slip of the knife or any type of cutting of
anything can alter the properties.

Our index properties on that particular test
were not even close to being consistent with what TRI,
who does all of our testing in the past, who does
everything for us, they have come up with way different
results on that one. So the only thing I'm left to
213
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assume as a manufacturer is maybe my product was cut.

That's the only thing I can think of, because the water
flow went up to I think 170 gallons per minute. Ours
has never done that before. Only thing that would do
that was to have a wider opening of the fabric.

There were a lot of critical errors that were
brought to light in the last few months to you guys as a
committee. There was a lot of taxpayer dollars put in
this, federal taxpayer dollars. After two years it just
seems like -- you guys were just now getting the videos
to review at the last meeting -- that there might have
been some stuff put in there that you guys just didn't
realize. We would just like you, as the industry, we'd
like to ask you just to reconsider moving this thing
forward, just based off of everything that's come to
light. That's all I have, and I appreciate your time.

MR. DYKES: Next is Joel Sprague.

MR. SPRAGUE: I just wanted to make myself
available if there were questions about the testing.

Other than that, I have nothing to add.

MR. DYKES: Next is Roger Singleton. Okay.

That's all that signed up for public comment. Yes, sir,
Mr. Page. If you don't mind stepping up here.

MR. PAGE: Also back to the silt fence question, there was I believe a Type B product, either one or two that were tested, that also passed sensitive. So the Type B product will also be able to be used just like the Type A. I'm just asking, because it's also a price, there's another price issue when you're cutting a foot off the top. So Ben might have the old approved P Factor results, but if I'm not mistaken, the Type B as well passed the .030. Is that correct, Ben? I didn't know I was going to do all this. I apologize. I would have brought everything with me. Here again, if I'm not mistaken, a Type B fabric, which I'm not a manufacturer, but it passed the sensitive needs just like the Type A. In accordance to what I heard through my last questioning was the Type A works, so I just want to make sure that Type B will work as well on 4-foot centers 2-by-2 with the backing sewn on, because it was approved in the exact same manner as the Type A.

MR. DYKES: No, it wouldn't, because it's not 48 inches high, and the specs in the manual says it has to be a 48-inch product. So the Type B cannot be used
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for sensitive application.

MR. PAGE: And Type A being 36 inches, it's not 48.

MR. DYKES: It would have to be 48 also, because the spec calls for 48 inches.

MR. MASTRONARDI: It's 30 above ground.

MR. DYKES: I'm sorry. I misread that. I apologize. I was misreading the spec.

MR. MASTRONARDI: It says the height is to be shown on the sedimentation and erosion control plan. I have heard that question myself on would there be a minimum height required by the commission.

MR. DYKES: Yes. 36 inches.

MR. PAGE: So Type B cannot be used.

MR. DYKES: No, sir.

MR. PAGE: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.

Thank you.

MR. DYKES: Other matters, questions, comments, or recommendations from the committee at this time?

MR. MASTRONARDI: I do have a comment. in terms of the, I guess, on the insurance test, just an
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overview, what the department will do is we do lot samples and we also do random samples where we'll take product from the side of the road from the project, bring it back to our physical lab, and we'll test it. We're not going to be in the process but what we do is an ASTM flow-through test. I can't quote you the number. But my understanding is there will be nothing to govern that? I mean, as far as across that three-year period it's a piece of paper that says I promise I'm doing it right. Is there any other mechanisms that looks at quality assurance, quality control?

MR. DYKES: At this point, no. Nothing has been recommended, Marc. It's up for discussion.

MR. RUZOWICZ: We talked about it, but where's the money to come from for somebody to go around and inspect all this stuff the whole time? It gets to be really big.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. I think the challenge would be if the -- I hesitate to say this, but I think the challenge would be if I were found to be in noncompliance by the EPD, then I would be challenging my
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fabric. Someone is going to be paying for it eventually. That will be the question somewhere down the road. They'll be looking back at that issue. Or you'll just hang your hat on the fact you have a certification statement.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Might be no different than what happens today as far as people selling stuff that's not Type C as Type C.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Right. My point is, internally for us we have that ability to go grab a piece of fabric and do that.

MR. RUZOWICZ: We do have index properties for the ones that we did test, so those still are there, so you could still go back and check the index properties to see if they were close to what we had previously tested for this stuff. And we do have a mass and areas, whatever, for compost socks. So as new BMPs come up, we might be able to come up with some new index. That's all I can think of for those plans kind of thing.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I was just thinking about the variability. We have unfortunately found issues where we've had to remove a lot of fence and reinstall.
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MR. RUZOWICZ: Again, it happens to people all the time out there now with the traditional Types A, B, and C that they have. Sometimes they get sold the wrong thing by the wrong person or they buy the wrong thing. I don't know.

MR. SPRAGUE: Might I make one comment? Most of your Georgia manufacturers aren't NTPEP companies, so Willacoochee, Belton, Propex, they're all, if that requirement were simply added, then you've got specifics materials that in essence you can track back to, and there's some built-in QA.

MR. RUZOWICZ: So by specifying NTPEP we get that thing you're talking about without having to pay for additional stuff, so that would be a benefit of going through NTPEP.

MR. DYKES: Other comments, recommendations?

MR. MORAN: One of the things that is done now for DOT fabric, there's WINFAB or Belton, whatever, is printed on the silt fence. Are you going to print sensitive or nonsensitive, whatever it's going to be, on the silt fence before you can install it?

MR. RUZOWICZ: The specification in the manual
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is that they had to print their, whatever it was, every so many feet, and then per application, whether they are sensitive or nonsensitive, put them into that category, not that they had to print it on the thing. Let's see what it says.

MR. MORAN: While you're looking that up, there really needs to be a strength requirement on a silt fence, whether it's NTPEP classification silt fence or it's Georgia DOT. I think you have to have that on there and have it fall in with a certain category or what have you. You have it on this thing.

MR. RUZOWICZ: Right. I understand, and we had talked about that before: Is it fair to have it for silt fence and to not have it for another BMP? So that's what the group had struggled with. I'm fine with telling all silt fence you got to have all these index properties and these apparent opening sizes too, but then over here you got maybe a compost filter sock that doesn't have all those index properties because they haven't applied to. Is that fair? And that's what we struggled with the whole first round. So, I mean, yes, I'm good with leaving all the index properties in for
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sediment barriers. That's no problem. But is it fair to have it for one and not for something else that doesn't have those same applications?

MR. MASTRONARDI: But again, we're not testing for the same things you test compost filter socks for either.

MR. RUZOWICZ: True.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I don't know if fairness is the right thing. I think the concern that was mentioned in terms of -- you know, again, if you're producing miles of fabric and we can remove two or three strands, that amounts to something at the end. You may never see it. It takes maybe one odd catch that somebody finds that mistake is there. But if there is nothing to speak to that, you do run that risk of finding out too late.

I think the other part, when I listen to this, is just as it has been in the past, the DOT will probably still carve up a way that we'll do things. It may be very similar to what we're doing today.

MR. FAUCETTE: Marc or Bob, do you have a recommendation as to what that should be, the tensile strength, or keep what you have?
MR. MORAN: You test the DOT silt fence, not that this was the greatest test, but it's the test, right? And NTPEP, based upon that e-mail I got the other day that I shared, they are offering as part of their basket of testing the 11340, right? To me it's sort of up to the manufacturer. If you make whatever it is and you say okay, Georgia requires 11340, do I want to test X number of silt fences, to use that as an example, or whatever it would be, to make sure I come up with one that's sensitive or nonsensitive.

I still think in the long run you're going to find that NTPEP, AASHTO, whatever, is kind of the 800-pound gorilla in the room, if you will. And based on the manufacturer's standpoint, because we don't want to make 48 silt fences for 48 states, but we will make something that meets what the state requires based upon the results they get through NTPEP. A good example is Virginia. I used that before. They have a specific requirement in terms of NTPEP as far as physical properties, tensile, and so forth, but then they also have a performance test which is the index test 5141. So that's not a problem. I don't have any problem with
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that and we'll do that testing. They require it every
230,000 square feet, which is not a lot of silt fence.
So we do that.

But NTPEP to me is the big dog. When you put
up that chart the other day, it was 24, 25, 26 states,
and even more and more states I think were going to it
at least for physical properties. They may not go for
performance but they'll do their own thing maybe. I
think we're kind of missing the boat. Fine, you want to
have a performance factor, that's great. I'm all for
performance factors, but I think it's got to work within
the framework of the DOT and NTPEP, and it works better,
at least from my standpoint as a manufacturer.

MR. FAUCETTE: So as far as the index test,
the material spec from NTPEP versus Georgia DOT, it
sounds like it's a little different.

MR. MORAN: No. Georgia DOT, here's their
physical properties right here, okay? Virginia doesn't
have the same physical properties. They just have one
silt fence right now. Maybe they'll go to more. Who
knows. Most states have sometimes two, three, four silt
fences and so forth. So I still have to meet these
properties right now, and then I submit to Georgia DOT,
and now you've added a P Factor, which is fine. I can
work around that. But I still think you need some
physical properties as far as strength goes on silt
fence because I think what the gentleman said is right.
I mean, to me the P Factor of .04, you probably couldn't
put up a 60-gram fabric. It wouldn't work. But you
could get some product that may or may not last. And
then there's also the UV factor, I mean, how long do you
want it to the stay up on a stake? You get stuff in
from overseas that you can put it up and two weeks later
it's white. I mean, there's some physical properties
that I think have to be involved when you do this. And
that's why I mentioned in the beginning, my little
monologue of everything we do we do for NTPEP, for the
most part, and then after that it kind of filters out
into the states based upon what their specifications
are.

MR. FAUCETTE: Ben mentioned this already, but
we did discuss this a fair amount in the previous TAC
Committee, whether we should or shouldn't and what that
should be. It's a very good discussion, I think. Are
you recommending maybe we should keep the DOT material specs as --

MR. MORAN: Uh-huh. And as it falls out -- I mean, anybody can design a silt fence any way they want, okay? It's not rocket science. We just got lucky, I'll be honest with you. I had no idea I was being tested for 11340. I turned it in and "poof" we passed, quote/unquote we passed. So, I mean, it can be done. Like I said, we make fences for different states, and I'm sure the folks over here do too, but I still think there needs to be some physical properties involved.

MR. PARKER: One of the reasons we shied away from that is how do you make that fair for all types of sediment barriers? If you give a physical property for a silt fence with a goal of anticipating certain longevity, what kind of physical property thresholds are you going to come up with for other types of products that we may not even know will exist yet?

MR. MORAN: For silt fence I think you're making a mistake. If you're going to use silt fence as a sediment barrier, you need some kind of physical property on it or you're going to be surprised what
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you're going to get. Maybe it will pass. I don't know. But it may not be up for long.

MR. PARKER: This is probably being naive but I would think that if a contractor installs a silt fence and it deteriorates in a week and he has to come back and reinstall over and over during the job, he's not going to buy that product again.

MR. MORAN: Assuming it's being inspected on the job.

MR. PARKER: Yes. All of this is assuming that it's properly designed, installed, maintained, and inspected.

MR. DYKES: I think that's a very important point, so I'd like to hear the committee's recommendation on should we add physical properties to silt fence sediment barriers.

MR. SPRAGUE: Just as it relates to the testing once again, to address this specifically, I know that when a company submits to NTPEP for large-scale testing, their submittal has to include physical properties information that then has to go into the report. So any information performance related is tied
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to specifically what the physical properties were of that material, whether it's fabric material or whether it's a sock type material. So they've kind of figured out which index properties those folks who make these things need to report. So it may then mean that when it comes time to put any kind of material on an approved product list or whatever, it will come with index properties that define it that could then be listed as well.

MR. FAUCETTE: I'll just add too I think -- well, I think a couple of things. Based on I think what Don and Bob and Marc are saying, I think I may lean towards potentially putting some sort of material spec in the Green Book. And I think in addition AASHTO and NRCS as well does have material specs for some of these other devices we could look at to add in as well.

MR. DYKES: Okay. All committee members in favor of adding some type of physical properties for silt fence as a sediment barrier raise your hand.

MR. WATSON: My hand is up. I have other comments. Seems like it's getting away from what the original direction that I was asked to be on this
committee for, which was to come up with performance criteria to have new BMPs. We're going down a path, in my opinion, that is taking away from what I was asked to do four years ago. I mean, I agree with all this. And I'm not one to say any product is better than any other product. It's how do you get these new products into the Green Book. That was why I was called. That's why I applied. And now we're to a lot of things that, it's all very good comments, but we could put all the specifications in the world but then how are you going to get new products into the Green Book? Seems like it's a bit beyond what at least my personal committee member assignment was.

MR. DYKES: Other comments, recommendations?

MR. MORAN: If your product is a silt fence, you have specifications. Filter socks is what's been new, is it not? It hasn't been around as long as silt fence, I don't believe. I'm not that familiar with the product. It was tested and it got in. So, I mean, if you're filling out the form for Georgia Soil and Water, you can put category whatever, and then we want to test for P Factor. Normally you put down, at least we do, so
many gram tensile pounds and so forth and so on, this is what we expect it to do. That's what we do for NTPEP. You have to put what you expect it's going to do and how it's going to perform. And then when you submit it in -- and I don't know what it would be. Maybe if it's something biodegradable and it lasts six months, that's all you need, it performs.

MR. MASTRONARDI: Brian, I think that doesn't take away the ability to bring something in, because you are still looking for the performance result.

MR. WATSON: I agree.

MR. MASTRONARDI: To give you an example, and this may sound real strange to you but this is a legitimate proposal we once saw at the department that was a Styrofoam sediment barrier with the perforations in it at a certain elevation to drain the water through. So if it met the P Factor, then you would then have to at some point pull in those EPA requirements for those Styrofoam constituents, whatever is comprised of that. I'm sure there's some governance for toxicity and so forth. I think that would just be the natural progression of performance gets you in the game, right?
Then the commission has got the heavy lift to figure out what else does that need. Right now we're saying that what else already exists for silt fence, being tensile strength and so on.

MR. WATSON: I'm not disagreeing with that. What I'm going to reiterate is on the different property, on the additional properties or properties that need to be included for these different products, that was not my understanding of why I was asked to be on the commission.

MR. MASTRONARDI: I understand.

MR. WATSON: I agree that those things are needed, but in terms of what input I was thinking I was providing was based on how do we get new products in and how do you compare two types of silt fences or how do you compare two types of sediment barriers. That's what I was under the impression. Because where you could see it as, yeah, let's put these different specifications, these other qualities on, let's just call it silt fence right now, now how are we going to start comparing those? Are those going to be what's meeting or not meeting, or is it just to put it on just so we have it?
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I'm not upset with DOT. The progression of this is getting more and more to where I'm feeling that the commission is falling on the committee to make some decisions that I was not under the impression that the committee was going to be providing information on.

MR. DYKES: Other comments?

MR. PAGE: Real quick. The people that manufacture Type C products, fabric, I think it would be a courtesy for them for some type of a grace period. Because this fabric is very expensive to manufacture and I'm quite sure that there are quite a few people that have tremendous amount of inventory with this product. And if this is implemented January 1, I can assure you there will be a great number of rolls of Type C silt fence that will be left for decoration because it will no longer be used. I don't know the exact price, but my product compared to a roll of Type A, it will be less than half. So they are not going to buy my product. Everyone that manufactures this product, whether DOT ops to stick with the original program or ever how it goes, the manufacturers of these materials need an opportunity to get rid of their old inventory, because it is very,
very costly. When I order a load of netting, it's like almost $100,000, and when you order a load of fabric, and it will be a big thing for the guys that manufacture this stuff to give them a justified grace period to eliminate their old inventory. I think that's it, Brent.

MR. DYKES: Thank you. Other comments from the committee? Okay. We will call the committee back as need arises in the months or days ahead, weeks ahead, but at this time we stand adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>et (4)</th>
<th>30:17,17</th>
<th>106:4 107:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exists (2)</td>
<td>78:16</td>
<td>229:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expand (5)</td>
<td>38:8</td>
<td>39:2,18 101:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expect (5)</td>
<td>35:10</td>
<td>85:11 203:2 228:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expecting (2)</td>
<td>36:9</td>
<td>205:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expense (3)</td>
<td>134:6</td>
<td>165:3 167:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended (2)</td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>230:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience (1)</td>
<td>212:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced (1)</td>
<td>85:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain (2)</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>24:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation (1)</td>
<td>24:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explore (1)</td>
<td>129:6</td>
<td>102:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express (4)</td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>11:2,17 22:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressed (1)</td>
<td>178:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extend (2)</td>
<td>85:6</td>
<td>107:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended (2)</td>
<td>41:10</td>
<td>41:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive (1)</td>
<td>37:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely (1)</td>
<td>111:2</td>
<td>129:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exact (7)</td>
<td>8:6</td>
<td>102:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exactly (9)</td>
<td>15:18</td>
<td>35:6 88:14 112:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example (9)</td>
<td>9:4</td>
<td>17:18,20,22 38:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excelsior (6)</td>
<td>26:19</td>
<td>30:11,19 38:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exception (1)</td>
<td>179:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclude (2)</td>
<td>39:2</td>
<td>130:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluded (1)</td>
<td>32:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excuse (1)</td>
<td>204:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>execution (3)</td>
<td>118:16,17 125:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive (2)</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercise (1)</td>
<td>153:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exist (2)</td>
<td>51:7</td>
<td>224:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facets (1)</td>
<td>133:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities (2)</td>
<td>142:7</td>
<td>163:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility (1)</td>
<td>210:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact (7)</td>
<td>37:5 92:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor (64)</td>
<td>7:13,17</td>
<td>9:6,22 10:6,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure (1)</td>
<td>210:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly (1)</td>
<td>64:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness (1)</td>
<td>220:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall (11)</td>
<td>33:16</td>
<td>39:13 70:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabric (24)</td>
<td>99:19</td>
<td>10:22,22 199:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failed (9)</td>
<td>50:16,22</td>
<td>52:5 59:17 85:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure (4)</td>
<td>51:21</td>
<td>78:4 86:16 188:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fails (2)</td>
<td>181:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure (7)</td>
<td>149:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair (18)</td>
<td>37:19 70:6</td>
<td>101:16 120:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140:13 158:8</td>
<td>160:23 162:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184:12,13 189:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190:6 195:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219:14,21 220:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223:21 224:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly (1)</td>
<td>64:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness (1)</td>
<td>220:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall (11)</td>
<td>33:16</td>
<td>39:13 70:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129:23 146:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148:21 153:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166:10,15 204:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falling (1)</td>
<td>230:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falls (4)</td>
<td>8:17 65:14</td>
<td>102:10 224:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpaved</td>
<td>169:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unquantified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td>230:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper</td>
<td>144:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usage</td>
<td>24:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use</td>
<td>81:3:5:9:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid</td>
<td>197:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>30:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variability</td>
<td>9:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variables</td>
<td>126:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variances</td>
<td>176:14:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety</td>
<td>32:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various</td>
<td>10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var</td>
<td>39:22:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetable</td>
<td>30:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetative</td>
<td>46:13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicle</td>
<td>80:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velocity</td>
<td>24:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vector</td>
<td>158:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendor</td>
<td>153:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendors</td>
<td>164:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbiage</td>
<td>99:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verify</td>
<td>117:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versa</td>
<td>51:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version</td>
<td>5:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vot</td>
<td>108:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasnt</td>
<td>9:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>28:3:5:3:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waters</td>
<td>176:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watkinsville</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wat</td>
<td>2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanted</td>
<td>20:9:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wait</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>184:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking</td>
<td>175:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td>103:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wash</td>
<td>67:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>106:8:14:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

email@tobyfeldman.com  Toby Feldman, Inc.  Certified WOB

tobyfeldman.com  NATIONWIDE SERVICES  (800) 246.4950
| 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 |
| **800 pound (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 |