

**Standards Oversight Council**  
Meeting Minutes  
September 24, 2007  
WLWCA Offices  
702 E. Johnson St., Madison

Present: Pat Murphy NRCS, Perry Lindquist WALCE, Ed Odgers DATCP, Bruce Webendorfer UWEX, Bruce Olson WALCE, Julian Zelazny WLWCA, Kevin Hogan SOC Coordinator  
Absent: Lynita Docken Comm, Gordon Stevenson DNR

The meeting began with a review of the minutes and Action Register from the July 23 SOC meeting. No revisions to the minutes were suggested. A general comment was made about the Center for Watershed Protection in Maryland. It was noted that this organization has worked under contract with other states to help develop technical standards, and SOC may want to consider using them for future development of stormwater-related technical standards.

Work Team Updates

Feed Storage Leachate Standard and Companion Document (NRCS)—As noted in the minutes from the July 23 meeting, the work team for this standard completed its work this summer. At this point, NRCS will determine how to incorporate elements of the Feed Storage Leachate standard and the previously completed Milking Center Wastewater Treatment standard into the NRCS 629 Waste Treatment standard. Scott Mueller at NRCS is handling this task. However, due to workloads resulting from the summer's floods in SW Wisconsin, he hasn't been able to devote time to this project. Also, the work team's final task was to complete an outline for a Companion Document to the technical standard. The outline was completed and delivered to NRCS this summer. At this point, further progress on a Companion Document will require volunteers to do the research, writing and compilation. SOC members suggested enlisting two members from the work team, along with a couple volunteers from NRCS.

Wet Detention Pond Team (DNR)— Work on revising the DNR's Wet Detention Pond technical standard (1001) is nearing completion. At a Sept. 28 meeting, the SOC work team will finish responding to all comments received in the broad review phase of standard development.. A final draft of the technical standard then will be prepared, and three work team members are scheduled to discuss the revised standard at a Nov. 7 WisLine Web conference on stormwater management.

Proprietary Stormwater Devices Team (DNR)— Work on this new DNR technical standard is just entering the broad review phase. The standard, which will set criteria for evaluating and predicting the performance of proprietary stormwater sediment control devices, is scheduled for broad review distribution at the end of September to the SOC listserv, academics, manufacturers and stormwater management professionals. The comment period closes Oct. 17, and the SOC work team will meet thereafter to consider the comments received. In the meantime, members of the work team will provide a brief overview of the draft standard at the Nov. 7 WisLine Web conference.

Infiltration Trench Team (Comm)— Early work continues on a new Infiltration Trench technical standard for the Dept. of Commerce. At this point, the SOC work team has reviewed research materials, identified major issues to address in the standard's criteria section, and prepared initial drafts of the standard's first three sections.

Milking Center Wastewater Companion Document

Bruce W. reported that he received the latest draft of the Companion Document last week, and it's ready for layout. A few minor changes are expected from DATCP's Steve Struss, one of the document's authors. Then, the document will be ready for review by the work team that created the milkhouse wastewater standard. Also, NRCS' John Ramsden and Scott Mueller, and Ed Odgers, will review the new Companion Document.

Regarding a Feed Storage Leachate Companion Document, Bruce W. said his office would be able to help with creating the document. As soon as someone is selected to take the lead on writing the Companion Document, Bruce said he'd like to meet with the person. Discussing who to solicit for the Feed Storage Leachate Companion Document project, Pat M. said he'll discuss the topic with John Ramsden and Scott Mueller. The outline for the Companion Document will be a good starting point. It also was noted that Brian Holmes, who has worked on the milkhouse wastewater document, would be a good resource—perhaps he could suggest an ag. engineering grad student who may be interesting in helping with the Companion Document. The question also was raised whether it would be appropriate to consider contract technical writers for work on companion documents.

#### Update on Team Formation to Revise NRCS 382 Fence Standard

The SOC Coordinator is working with the team leader to solicit work team members and determine an initial meeting date and location. The team leader has a working draft of a revised Fence standard that was culled from standards in several other states. SOC members cautioned that this draft should not be distributed to team members at the initial meeting. Instead, team members should first be involved in a discussion of what is most important to revise/update in the old standard. Otherwise, the team will tend to latch on to the approach proposed in the team leader's draft.

#### DOT Participation in SOC, Custodian of Slope Stabilization Standard

Ed reported that he has attempted to meet with DOT's Dan Scudder to discuss DOT's participation in SOC, as well as the agency's interest in acting as Custodian of a potential new Slope Stabilization technical standard. However, Dan Scudder has not responded to Ed's messages. Alternatively, Ed said he'll try to connect with DOT folks through Gil Layton of Layton Environmental, who has contacts within DOT. Even if DOT is not interested in joining SOC or in acting as Custodian for the Slope Stabilization standard, we still could solicit DOT personnel to participate on SOC work teams.

If DOT declines to act as Custodian, Plan B is to approach DNR to serve as Custodian. Pat M. will approach DNR's Gordon Stevenson about this, and also will ask if DNR has any resources to devote to a new technical standard. Ed set a two-week timeline for he and Pat to follow-up on this custodian issue.

Another option raised by SOC members is to contract with a consultant, such as Gil Layton, to draft a Slope Stabilization technical standard with input from a SOC work team and the Custodian agency. However, Bruce O. noted the concern that the Custodian agency may reject the consultant's work.

#### Revised Scope Statement for a Slope Stabilization Standard

SOC members reviewed the 8/2/07 revised draft of a Scope Statement for a potential new Slope Stabilization standard. This version is based on discussions at a May 29, 2007 Scope Session, input from session participants, and comments on an earlier draft presented to SOC members at the July 23, 2007 council meeting. SOC members agreed the Scope Statement is in good shape and will be used to help solicit work team members when the decision is made to proceed with creating the new standard.

At this point, before soliciting team members, we need a Custodian to commit to this standard. Ed said we need to reassess the resources and level of commitment from DNR. For example, does DNR have the funds to compensate a consultant like Gil Layton to be in charge of writing the standard, if SOC decides to go that route?

On the issue of whether a Slope Stabilization standard is needed, Bruce O. said he's received feedback that county personnel don't want another technical standard, and that a separate Slope Stabilization standard would overlap with a lot of existing technical standards. For example, many county personnel believe that a lot of problems with slopes can be dealt with via shaping and seeding, and products on DOT's PAL list. Pat M. responded that SOC needs to clearly delineate where and how a Slope Stabilization standard would be used, and ensure that it doesn't overlap with existing standards. Perhaps

we need to consider instances where slope failures have occurred, including what actually happened and what caused the failure, Pat said.

#### Incorporating SOC Policy Manual Items into TSPH

At the July 23 meeting, SOC members agreed to move four items from the SOC Policy Manual into the Technical Standards Process Handbook (TSPH). To prepare for this meeting, the SOC Coordinator incorporated the four items into various sections of the TSPH. SOC members reviewed the revised TSPH sections and approved the changes, with minor edits. Regarding the item for reimbursement of work team members for meeting expenses, SOC members noted that up to now, SOC has not received any formal requests for reimbursements. For the time being, the reimbursement language will be added to p. 23 of the TSPH as a SOC-level responsibility, and perhaps later SOC will provide more guidance on this issue. When SOC addresses its first reimbursement request, it likely will set a precedent.

At this point, the SOC Coordinator will add the minor edits to the TSPH text, and also will edit the remaining provisions in the SOC Policy Manual. At the next meeting, SOC members will review the edited SOC Policy Manual.

#### Results of Technical Standards Needs Assessment (TSA)

The SOC Coordinator distributed to SOC members a document tallying the responses received from the Technical Standards Needs Assessment conducted in late August and early September. The results will help SOC set priorities in its next two-year Work Plan.

Pat said NRCS currently is undergoing its mandatory 5-year review of all Section IV technical standards. When changes are made to standards at the NRCS national level, state NRCS offices also must make revisions to their versions to conform.

Pat said he'll take the tally of TSA responses back to NRCS. He and John Ramsden will identify which standards the SOC process will be able to provide the most valuable input to.

Ed requested that NRCS come back to SOC with an opinion whether the agency agrees with the tally responses. Ed also suggested that NRCS conduct a workload assessment to determine the level of revisions needed for each NRCS standard pegged for updating.

At the next meeting, SOC members will revisit the TSA tally responses and use them to begin setting priorities for the 2008-09 SOC Work Plan.

#### Updating SOC Website

SOC members decided that bringing the SOC Website up to date is a priority for the SOC Coordinator in October. DATCP's Mike Murray, the former SOC Coordinator, will be available for 4-5 hours of consulting on Website maintenance and use of FrontPage software.

#### **Action Items**

**Pat** will discuss with John Ramsden and Scott Mueller options to get volunteers for a Feed Storage Leachate Companion Document

**Ed** will attempt to connect with DOT folks to discuss slope stabilization custodianship/participation

**Pat** will discuss slope stabilization custodianship with Gordon Stevenson

**SOC Coordinator** will edit the SOC Policy Manual

**Pat** will get NRCS feedback on TSA responses and NRCS standards appropriate for SOC input

**SOC Coordinator** will work on SOC Website maintenance issues