

MINUTES
NORTH CAROLINA SEDIMENTATION CONTROL COMMISSION
COMMISSION'S TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 21, 2021
ONLINE WEBEX MEETING

The North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission's Commission Technical Committee met on October 21, 2021 at 3:30 p.m. online via WebEx. The following persons were in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Mark Taylor (Chair)
Ms. Karyn Pageau (Vice-Chair)
Mr. Donald Pearson
Dr. Rich McLaughlin
Mr. Steve Albright

OTHERS

Mr. Brian Wrenn, Director, DEMLR, DEQ
Ms. Julie Coco, State Sediment Specialist, DEMLR, DEQ
Mr. Graham Parrish, Assistant State Sediment Specialist, DEMLR, DEQ
Ms. Rebecca Coppa, Sediment Education Specialist, DEMLR, DEQ

Minutes:

Chair Mark Taylor began the meeting at 3:30 pm.

Draft meeting minutes from 9/16/21 were approved by consensus.

Mr. Taylor began by reminding the committee that he, Ms. Pageau and DEMLR are still working together to create a list of vetted resources for the committee and if the committee have suggestions for that list, they can be discussed during the open discussion portion of this meeting at the end.

Mr. Taylor handed the floor over to Dr. McLaughlin to begin going over his and Ms. Smith's review/comments. Dr. McLaughlin started with stockpiling topic. Mr. Pearson brought up the question of whether the NCG01 be incorporated by reference or if the text should be copied and pasted into the Manual itself. Discussion ensued on this question. Opinions ranged that incorporating it by reference meant the manual wouldn't need to be updated every time the NCG01 changes versus putting the information directly in the Manual meant people using the Manual would have all the information in one place. Ms. Pageau asked if DEMLR wants the existing stockpile topic to be made more robust or wants a completely new standard to be

added. Ms. Coco answered that regarding this topic DEMLR just wants it to be more robust. Mr. Taylor commented that regional staff did ask for more information and/or a new detail for stockpiles. Mr. Taylor also commented that a contractor wouldn't initially think to look for the stockpile topic where it is currently located in the Manual under topsoiling. Mr. Wrenn added that in general DEMLR wants to provide information and be specific but doesn't want to be so prescriptive that it doesn't provide flexibility. Mr. Taylor deferred the question of if stockpiles should be their own practice standard to a later discussion in the interest of time.

Dr. McLaughlin moved on to temporary slope drains on page 6.32.3. They added wording after number 6 about the installation of t-posts or stakes. It was suggested that the added verbiage be its own number.

Mr. Taylor commented that the word grommet should be updated/modernized within or removed from the manual.

Dr. McLaughlin moved on to Temporary Diversions in section 6.20. Dr. McLaughlin stated his mission for this section was addressing that check dams should be required/incorporated. Under Figure 60.20b Dr. McLaughlin recommended removing the Diversions that serve longer than 30 working days, and discussion ensued. The consensus was that it can be removed but instead of recommending/requiring seeding to require groundcover or to say to be stabilized which are both less prescriptive than specifying seeding.

Mr. Taylor raised the point that check dams may not always be beneficial in temporary diversions and may not need to be required or should be based on velocity. Mr. Taylor also proposed it could be based on slope of the channel. Discussion ensued.

Dr. McLaughlin moved to section 6.22 where they added a concept from the NCDOT about diverting the clean water coming onto a project and keeping it clean. The consensus was that the diversion lining should be impermeable. Mr. Pearson asked if the section name should be changed. It was changed to simply Perimeter Diversion. The wording was also changed from dike to berm (will need to go through and make sure the new language is consistent throughout the section).

Mr. Taylor then opened the floor for open discussion for the remaining time. Mr. Taylor opened the floor with the question to the committee of did the committee like this process/method of review and should be continued in the future? The committee agreed that reviewing live as a group was beneficial and preferred. The committee set the goal to review one group each meeting going forward with the group that was reviewed in the prior meeting also presenting a summary of changes from the feedback. It was also agreed that final wordsmithing should be the prerogative of DEMLR.

Mr. Pearson and Mr. Albright volunteered to be reviewed in the next meeting.

Ms. Coco presented the list she started of vetted resources for the committee.

The question was posed to DEMLR of what is the expectation, how far should the committee look and how much should be edited and included from other resources? Ms. Coco stated that if a practice from other states/programs could benefit North Carolina E&SC then it should be reviewed and possibly incorporated as long as we stay within the bounds of our state laws.

Mr. Pearson posed the question if the committee should recommend DEMLR consider a partnership with an engineering firm to help update the manual. And that new practice standards/information could come from this 3rd party source instead of from the committee/DEMLR so the committee could review rather than generate information. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Pearson will seek feedback from DEMLR on this question and address it at a future meeting.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is scheduled for 3:30-5:00 pm on November 18.

Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm