

**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting  
July 18, 2012  
Gwinnett Justice and Administration Center  
Lawrenceville, GA**

**Those in attendance were:**

Lauren Zdunczyk	Reece Parker
Ben Ruzowicz	Marc Mastronardi
Guerry Thomas	Diane Guthrie
Davie Biagi	Adena Fullard
Britt Faucette	Dewey Richardson
Ellis Lamme (guest)	

Mrs. Zdunczyk called the meeting to order. Committee members were given copies of the preliminary testing results. Mrs. Zdunczyk informed the Committee that Mr. Sprague will be invited to come in and discuss the results as soon as the remaining testing is complete. Mrs. Zdunczyk asked members to look over the results and submit any comments and/or concerns they have so far.

Mrs. Zdunczyk explained that she, Mr. Ruzowicz, and Mr. Thomas have discussed the revisions to the manual and a PowerPoint presentation was used to outline the proposed changes:

*Removal of anti-seep collars:* The Committee discussed the pros and cons of using them. Ms. Guthrie stated that NRCS does not approve use of them in GA. Ms. Fullard stated that she would rather the designers have a choice of which anti seep device to use and she thinks we should leave it in – Mr. Parker agreed with this suggestion. The Committee agreed to leave the anti seep collar in as an option.

*DOT recommendation regarding a silt gate:* Mr. Ruzowicz outlined the two options 1)add silt gate specs or 2) modify slotted board dam with stone. He also suggested that the definition be changed in order for this to be used with other applications. The Committee agreed to change the definition.

*Temporary Stream Crossings:* Should the wording say that a temporary stream crossing *shall* or *should* be used on streams with a draining area greater than one mile? The Committee discussed revising the manual to state that any drainage area over 1 square mile must be calculated and certified by a Professional Engineer. Ms. Guthrie discussed the practices currently used by NRCS – she will send GSWCC copies of those details. The Committee agreed to remove “shall” and insert “should” and also to add the statement regarding areas with drainage over 1 square mile.

\*See attached comments from Committee Members

*Rock filter dam:* Mr. Thomas explained that there should be no practices in the Manual that allow for practices in live streams. He proposed to revise the book to include definitions, conditions, and design criteria. The Committee agreed to remove the 50 acre requirement.

*Temporary sediment traps* – Does the Manual need an alternative form of sediment storage for smaller sites? Mr. Richardson asked if there was a maintenance page. Mr. Thomas stated that there is and that he will add it. Mr. Mastronardi suggested that the clean out level be changed from 1/3 to 1/4 full. The Committee agreed to this suggestion as well as to take out the sentence that states “intended for use in small streams”.

Mr. Parker expressed concern about the “live stream” statement – Mr. Richardson suggested referencing the EPD guidance memo.

Ms. Fullard stated that she would like time to study the Commission’s draft report of the testing results a little more. Ms. Zdunczyk stated this will be fine and that she could send comments to her or Mr. Ruzowicz.

*General revisions for silt fence fabrics:* Should all approved silt fence fabrics be required to be on the DOT approved product list? Mr. Mastronardi warned that if this is required, the ability to test samples from out in the field will be lost. Ms. Fullard stated that standards are needed because there are a lot of inferior products out there. Mr. Parker asked why one product would go through one test for effectiveness and another for longevity? Ms. Guthrie asked if testing will be required for new products, whether made of fabric or not. Mr. Parker suggested, and Mr. Mastronardi agreed, that the standard regarding DOTs approved list should be removed because it is not applicable to all types of sediment barriers and consistency should be maintained throughout the testing. Mr. Parker also stated that if budget considerations were no object, the GDOT list requirement could be kept and then testing done on the other types of sediment barriers for longevity.

*Check Dams:* Mr. Ruzowicz informed the Committee that the hay bale practice was tested as instructed in the Manual and it failed. New testing was done based on NRCS testing details and it did really well.

*General Revisions:*

Suggestion to add a disclaimer stating that all products and practices should not be cationic or environmentally unfriendly and shall be determined to be non toxic in accordance with EP-A-821-R-02-012. Ms. Guthrie suggested changing the statement to “all applicable” instead of naming the standard.

New products/practices – Silt Curtain – The Commission suggested adding this practice to the Manual. Ms. Guthrie suggested adding the statement that “this is only for water quality purposes, not sediment storage” and the Committee agreed.

Ways to use remaining grant funds (\$104,314). Members agreed that the money should be used for more testing. Members will submit suggestions on products to Ms. Zdunczyk in the next couple of days.

Mr. Ruzowicz suggested testing flocculants or PAM materials. Mr. Mastronardi stated that with flocculants, you have to be soil specific when testing.

Hydraulically Applied and Rolled Erosion Control Products - Mr. Ruzowicz discussed the testing results and suggested changing the C factor to reflect the conditions of the site. The Committee suggested changing the wording to Applied Products instead of Hydraulically Applied Products.

Mr. Ruzowicz asked if someone working within 200 ft state waters will have a more stringent C factor than someone who is not. Mr. Parker stated that the C factor should not change from one slope to another. Mr. Ruzowicz proposed that the Committee decide the slopes and then see what the C factors are. Mr. Mastronardi asked what the Committee thought about setting a range of slope sizes. Ms. Guthrie suggested doing another test using just straw on the slope. Dr. Faucette stated that he thought that TTI had already done this testing. The Committee suggested changing the slope to 3:1 and to keep the same C factor.

The next meeting will be scheduled after the testing is complete.

\*Comments Submitted by Committee Members after review of the minutes

*Comments from Reece Parker:*

Under the paragraph titled: “Temporary Stream Crossings”, it states that we discussed “revising the manual to state that any drainage area over 1 square mile must be calculated and certified by a Professional Engineer.” I’m fine with that because this is a large amount of runoff to deal with so it is a critical calculation. However, I think we need to change it to either read “...by a Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect” or “...by a licensed design professional”. I bring this up because Georgia law allows Landscape Architects to practice stormwater management and erosion control design. I’m aware of the fact that some metro-Atlanta local municipalities have adopted an ordinance that excludes landscape architects from stormwater design, but a majority of the state municipalities do allow landscape architects to design stormwater conveyance and detention/retention. Here are excerpts from the GA code that support my claim:

FYI regarding LA licensure in our state... Georgia law provides that landscape architecture means the performance of professional services, including, but not limited to, consultation, investigation, planning, design, preparation of drawings and specifications, and responsible supervision, all in connection with the preservation or determination of proper land uses, natural land features, esthetics, planting plans, the shaping of land to produce the best functional and esthetic effect, and grading plans with determination of drainage. This term shall also include the consideration of environmental problems involving land areas, as such problems relate to the public health, safety, and welfare. O.C.G.A. § 43-23-1(3). Importantly, O.C.G.A. § 43-23-16 specifically provides that nothing in the Landscape Architects Act “shall be construed as . . . excluding a landscape architect registered under [the Act] from such architectural or engineering practice as may be incidental to the practice of landscape architecture.” Regarding stormwater management, the Attorney General concluded that O.C.G.A. § 43-23-1(3) authorizes landscape architects to prepare “project site plans and land subdivision plans, including layout, storm water management, grading, and erosion and sediment control.” 1990 Ga. Op. Att’y Gen. 12