

MINUTES
STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE
August 17, 2005
Atlanta Athletic Club

Present were Stakeholder Advisory Board members, Alice Champagne, Doug Easter, Jim Hamilton, JoAnn Macrina, James Magnus, Robert Ringer, Greg Teague and Ben Thompson. Also present from the Soil and Water Conservation Commission were Michaelyn Rozar and Lauren Zdunczyk.

Mr. Hamilton welcomed members to the meeting and congratulated the Board on their one year anniversary. He thanked everyone for their dedication and hard work.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Review and Approve minutes from June 15, 2005

There being no discussion on the minutes, Mr. Teague made a motion to approve the minutes with a second from Ms. Macrina. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. One year later

- **Review the goals and objectives of the education program**

Mr. Hamilton read the Stakeholders Responsibilities as follows:

- Work with EPD and the Commission to establish, evaluate and maintain the education and training program established by the Act.
- Responsibilities include but are not limited to:
 - Reviewing course curricula
 - Reviewing education materials
 - Reviewing exam and testing procedures
 - Evaluating training and instructing qualifications

Ms. Rozar informed the group that the certification is a work in progress. The Commission is in the process of evaluating the feedback from SAB and the pilot courses and would be finalizing the course material for Level IA, IB and II by mid – fall.

Ms. Rozar also informed the SAB that finalized material would be updated about every 6 months to keep the material accurate and up to date.

- **Review continued role of SAB to advise GSWCC in making this a very successful program for Georgia.**

Mr. Hamilton stressed the importance of SAB in put and recommended that each SAB member attend a certification course.

3. Overview of pilot program from GSWCC including course results and proposed modifications. SAB to provide input.

Ms. Zdunczyk distributed a Progress Report to each Stakeholder. The progress report provided the following information for Level IA, IB and II:

- Overview of course
- Examination results for each pilot course
- Pilot course evaluation results
- Proposed adjustments sheets
- Course applications

Trainer section included:

- Eligibility requirements for Trainer Level I and Trainer Level II
- Results from Trainer Level I Pilot Course
- Evaluation results from Trainer Level I Pilot Course
- List of Approved Instructors
- Trainer Level I and Level II applications
- Trainer course notification form

Proctor section included:

- Proctoring requirements
- Evaluation results from Proctor Pilot Course
- List of Approved Proctors
- Proctor and Master proctor application
- Examination Chain of Custody
- Proctor Evaluation Report

Ms. Rozar reviewed the progress report with the Stakeholders. She reminded the Board that this program is still a work in progress and that the material would be finalized by early Fall.

Ms. Champagne asked if the material would be changed once it is finalized. Ms. Rozar, any revisions to the course material would not take place until January 2006. This would allow time for the material to be tested. Revisions to the material would reflect feedback received from the SAB, third party instructors and course participants.

The Board discussed the third party trainers. Ms. Rozar gave a brief overview of the Trainer course and informed the Board that all approved instructors would receive a shrink wrapped copy of the course notebook as well as a CD with course presentations.

Mr. Hamilton expressed his concern, that one instructor might not be able to give an entire course on their own. Mr. Magnus felt that one instructor could give the Level IA and IB course, Level II would be more difficult. Mr. Thompson felt that the pass/fail rate would be a good indicator, whether or not one instructor could give the course.

Ms. Zdunzyk distributed Trainer, Proctor, Level IA, IB, II course notebooks. Mr. Hamilton asked the Board to look through the notebooks and give any comments to Ms. Rozar.

Mr. Hamilton asked if there were any comments on the course material so far. Mr. Ringer felt that the Level IB NPDES presentation had too much information and too many slides and that would confuse the core audience. He felt that Level IA needs to focus on NPDES and Level IB needs to focus on GESA

Mr. Teague suggested that the GESA and NPDES presentations be combined. Mr. Magnus felt that GESA and NPDES should be kept separate and that combining them would make it too confusing.

Mr. Ringer presented the Board with his suggested revisions for the GESA, NPDES and Stream Buffer presentations. Mr. Hamilton asked the Board to look over the revisions and give their feedback as well. He asked the Board to please respond within a week's time.

The Board agreed to meet again October 19th, location TBA.

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned.

Submitted by
Lauren Zdunzyk