MINUTES
NORTH CAROLINA SEDIMENTATION CONTROL COMMISSION
COMMISSION'S TECHINCAL COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 22, 2022
ONLINE WEBEX MEETING

The North Carolina Sedimentation Control Commission's Commission Technical Committee met on October 22, 2022, at 3:00 p.m. in-person and 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
Mr. A.J. Lang
Mr. Donald Pearson
Mr. Steve Albright

OTHERS

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

Minutes:

The meeting began at 3:00 pm.

Draft meeting minutes from 9/15/22 were approved by consensus.

The committee then moved on to workgroup updates beginning with Mr. Pearson updating on his and Mr. Albright's work on Section 6.65 Porous Baffles. A discussion ensued, and edits were made throughout the text. The question was brought up if they want to continue to call it the generic category of porous baffle or limit it to coir fiber. Mr. Taylor pointed out that the standards are not always kept up to date and technology may change, and from that perspective we may not want to specify something that may become outdated before the next update. Mr. Taylor brought up to that a DEQ regional staff comment asked to include trench specs of the bottom of the baffle. Ms. Coco and the committee agreed that trenching was not required of the bottom of the baffle that it only needs to be pinned. Another DEQ regional staff comment was on the detail to change the baffle spacing from 25% of the length of the basin and Mr. Taylor proposed to change it to ¼ of the length. Mr. Taylor asked if turbidity curtain had a practice standard, Ms. Coco said no, and we need to decide if we want to encourage the

use of them in the basins and if we do we need to create a standard/detail for it which may be involved with how many variations there are. Mr. Pearson mentioned that NCDOT has two categories of turbidity curtains, and they may want to investigate them. Mr. Taylor recommended that more coir fiber references are changed to more generic terms throughout the standard but leaving a couple and mentioning them as approved examples. Mr. Albright commented that if they are changing references to be more generic what should they do in the materials section. Mr. Taylor commented that could be 'or equal to as approved by the plan engineer' or similar.

Mr. Pearson then moved on to 6.62 Sediment Fence/Silt Fence and began by commenting that they went through and changed all "fabric" references to "geotextile. There was some discussion on Mr. Lang's suggested rewording of the purpose of the sediment/silt fence, and it was agreed to use the suggestion. Mr. Lang questioned how often terraced/tiered silt fences are seen and if there are not better ES&C practices than terracing silt fences. Mr. Taylor answered that waddles, compost socks, and diversions are preferred, but otherwise there aren't many other choices.

Mr. Pearson asked about the comment that came in from the public about high hazard or 'extra strength' silt fences used in different locations. Mr. Pearson commented that there is only one strength of geotextile typically available and may want to simplify the language in the standard to unsupported and supported silt fence (supported with wire). It was noted that the material section/table would most likely also need to be updated and simplified to one minimum set of criteria. Then for supported, or wire backed fence, the post spacing can be spread from 6ft to 8ft in-between posts. Mr. Pearson and Mr. Albright also added some language about using silt fences to divert or move water like a diversion berm or channel. Mr. Taylor asked if we addressed silt fence outlets here? The agreed that it should at least be referenced here.

Ms. Coppa reminded the committee that the request from the South Fork River Project member was that we require wire mesh backed silt fencing along wetlands, streams, lakes or other surface water bodies as is required by the Mecklenburg County rules and the York County rules. Mr. Taylor and Ms. Coco commented that they recalled they called their high hazard silt fence was just a double row. Ms. Coco added that there is a statement in the manual that using double rows of silt fence doesn't increase the hydraulic or slope length even though a lot of people use a double row mainly when the 1st row failed or is about to collapse. Mr. Pearson brought the question back to if the committee wants to require/include wire mesh backed silt fencing, if it should be left to the engineer and plan reviewer, or if it's unnecessary? Mr. Taylor commented that he doesn't know if the standard is the place for what seems to be an environmental regulation of environmentally sensitive areas. Mr. Taylor asked Ms. Coco if she sees a reason for using this practice standard to talk about protecting sensitive waters and wetlands. Ms. Coco commented that the areas that require for example 404/401 buffer permits have strict requirements already. Mr. Taylor added that the situations they might be trying to protect against are those were there are no permits but by being adjacent to one of these

sensitive waters/wetlands still impact them. Mr. Taylor commented that E&SC protection treats all water the same in that it tries to keep sediment out of the water no matter the classification. It was also mentioned that there are some buffer rules, including those by NCDEQ-DEMLR-LQS and by NCDEQ-DWR, that helps to protect waterbodies. The committee agreed that this is a policy issue, not a practice update so isn't applicable to this committee.

Mr. Pearson and Mr. Albright agreed to make final edits to these sections based on this review and push it to DEMLR with any remaining questions/issues highlighted for them. But that the workgroup can of course reach out to other members of the committee to for help/comment for any of the final edits. Mr. Taylor also reminded the committee to check that the regional office comments have been considered before finalizing edits.

Mr. Pearson and Mr. Albright agreed to finish their practices (6.64 Skimmer Sediment Basin) in November. As time allows, Ms. Pageau and Mr. Lang will present section 6.54 Rock Doughnut Inlet Protection. Ms Pageau and Mr. Lang will present section 6.70 Temporary Stream Crossing in December. Mr. Taylor also said he could finish reviewing one of his standards following Mr. Pearson and Albright.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be a hybrid meeting and is scheduled for 3:00pm – 5:00pm on November 17, 2022.

Mr. Taylor adjourned the meeting at 5:06 pm.