

Construction & USLE Standard Team Meeting - AGENDA DRAFT

Thursday 11 June 2026 ▲ 9:00am – 2:30pm ▲
301 S Blount St #302, Madison, WI 53703-4664, USA

VIRTUAL via [Zoom](#)

9:00 Welcome & Introductions (Amy, Sam, Team; 30 min)
Goal: Get to know each other

Attendance: Lance Newman (Kapur Associates), Tim Troester (City of Madison), Jeremy Balousek (Dane County), Jeremy Ashauer (WisDOT), Brent Jalonen (Calumet Co), Mike Hackel (Homburg Contractors), Tony Vandermuss (Smith Group), Samantha Whitens (co-lead; WDNR), Amy Minser (co-lead; WDNR), Shannon Haydin (custodian; WDNR), Phil Purpero (C.W. Purpero Inc.), Carl Wepking (SOC)

9:30 SOC overview & logistics (Carl; 45 min)
Goal: Describe the process, roles, and practical considerations

Notes:

SOC overview –

- 1. What is the WI Standards Oversight Council (SOC)?**
- 2. What is a technical standard?**
- 3. Guiding principles**
- 4. Team roles and responsibilities**

Proposed rules –

- 1. What is the process for decision making – goal is consensus, 2/3ds will be used if necessary**
- 2. Quorum – need quorum to make decisions – set 50% threshold**
- 3. Don't bring problems without a few potential solutions**

10:15 Break (15 min)

10:30 Current Resources, Goals & Sideboards (Amy, Shannon)
Goal: Provide an overview of the standard, including DNR requirements and how the standard will be used. Define team mission & set sideboards.

Notes:

- Develop an approach to implement a 5 tons / acre / year threshold**
- Guidelines and goals:**
 - science based,**

- user friendly,
- avoid unsupported software (which is why RUSLE2 software was avoided previously), therefore either Excel (avoid, to avoid needing Microsoft product to use) or Webform (way of running back-end calculations to compute outputs)
- All sources of sediment should be considered
- All phases of construction should be included
- 12-14 months for tech standard process
 - The existing guidance document should provide an early lift to the standard development.
- Draft calendar discussed (see below for calendar, and notes)
- Scope question – dewatering?
 - Account for dewatering, but not a point of focus of the standard
 - Dewatering as a potential source of sediment
- Current guidance & spreadsheet (see PPT file – Sediment Discharge Overview of Current Guidance /Tool)
 - Goal is to discharge no more than 5 tons / acre / year
 - Check of a good erosion control plan, not a reason to do less
 - Subsoil erodes more easily than top soil – typical practice of removing top soil therefore poses problems
 - Experts to engage
 - Prof Nick Balster as possible expert to bring in (UW-Madison Soils Dept)
 - Prof Daniel Yoder from Univ Tennessee
 - Jeremy B – speak to the current USLE spreadsheet at the next meeting
 - Retrofitted from agriculturally focused conservation practices
- BMPs
 - Stabilize if period of inactivity is expected (14 days)
 - Divert water away from bare soil
 - Slope interruption
 - Duration
- DNR Spreadsheet
 - Left column is erosion control practice, right practice column is sediment control practice
 - Distinction – RUSLE2 predicts soil moving, not soil leaving a site which is the goal of these BMPs

11:00 Current approach and code language (Amy; 15 min)

Goal: Summarize existing methodology

11:15 Pros and cons of current methodology (Amy, Team; 45 min)

Goal: Identify what is effective and what may need to change

Brainstorm regarding existing issues:

1. Cons –

a. Would like the ability to use other BMPs –

i. Proposed solutions

- 1. Desire for more options (silt fence, basins, etc.)**
- 2. Need to review RUSLE2 in regards to sediment distribution**

3. Custom BMP – room for innovation
 4. All relevant tech standards as listed options here (currently available)
 - b. 50 year old model – there must be more up-to-date data
 - i. Can daily r factor be included to account for climate change
Proposed solutions
 - a. Daily r factor comes from RUSLE2 based on county – could explore whether this is worth importing, or looking for other options
 - ii. Dnr climate change initiative as incremental approach to updating materials to be consistent with changing climate
Proposed solutions
 - a. Avoiding proprietary software
 - c. Soil data needs updating – slope length data needs updating (referring to NRCS updates)
Proposed solutions
 1. Worth noting that soils are likely *not* the most sensitive factor here
 2. Current spreadsheet deals with subsoil
 3. How to deal with slopes – continuous, multiple – what is a representative slope
 - d. Idea of ‘beating’ the storm water requirement – intent needs to be followed and employed in the field
 - i. Engaging contractor needs to be included / addressed
Proposed solutions (brainstorm)
 1. Error or “no estimate” output from tool
 2. Result or output needs to then be reflected in the plan
 3. How to get contractors to incorporate – use of a table as opposed to lengthy text (which is often not reviewed / implemented).
 4. Contractor perspective – can’t be made simple enough (clear, concise)
 5. No clear ‘rule of thumb’ guidance
 - a. Could address with ‘considerations’ section
 - b. Matrix-type solution
 - i. Drawback – not bringing awareness to doctors that contribute to risk, that are highlighted when doing soil erosion calculations
 - c. Tiered solutions based on risk likelihood
 - i. Lower thresholds that require little intervention (say <1 acre and/or slopes less than 0.1%)
 - ii. Matrix based solution has the potential to become unwieldy – too many variables
- [idea for future meeting –
1. contractors share insights regarding practices and timelines – factors that contribute to implementation;
 2. engage folks from other states to see other approaches]

- e. Slope length estimate issues – 300 ft in actuality
Proposed solutions (see above)
- f. Addressing run-on as well as construction site itself
Proposed solutions
Steps
 1. Divert
 2. Account for, if can't be diverted
- g. Soil deposition factor and 15% / 20% cutoff (what is the limit of the RUSLE2 method?)

Proposed solutions
– need additional discussion regarding cutoff – lean 15% due to breakdown (revisit)
- h. Disconnection between design engineers and practical timelines
Proposed solutions (see above)
- i. Phasing – forced phasing (erosion control phasing and project phasing itself)
Proposed solutions
 1. Force phasing where possible / necessary
 2. Revisit language in existing guidance
- j. Crux – effective and practical tech standard
Proposed solutions
 1. Good guideline to keep in mind –
 2. Agreed.
 3. Visual learners – sketch inclusion would be helpful in adhering to plans (more simplified, fewer words)

[idea for future meeting – hearing from regulators regarding medium of the worst (as opposed worst of worst) what guides decision making, examples]
- k. Ways to include the right audience at the right time – if phasing is dictated early on, contractors and other stakeholders can understand timeline necessities
Proposed solutions (see above)
 - Considerations - be aware of timelines if modeled site characteristics need to be re-run
- l. Maximum bare soil acreage (approach of other states)
Proposed solutions
 - Could be added to hearing from representatives from other states
 - Revisit incentivization – early seeding establishment as example
- m. Timeline considerations – bidding, permitting, construction – and handoffs between stakeholders
Proposed solutions (see above)
- n. Enforcement question – carrot and stick – how many infractions vs how many shut-downs?

Proposed solutions

- Fodder for future meeting – how Dane Co handles this
- o. PSC (Public Service Commission) & DNR as potential enforcement agencies – some question about how much authority is possessed here.

Proposed solutions (see above)

- p. DNR tradeoff between permitting (application review) and inspection

Proposed solutions – something for DNR to consider

2. Pros –

- a. Planning tool
- b. Drawn attention to high-risk areas – targeting erosion control where it's needed

12:00 *Lunch, provided* (30 min)

12:30 Brainstorming possible approaches (Sam, Carl; 60 min)

Goal: Identify possible approaches for future consideration

(See blue notes above for solutions)

1:30 Discussing research or presentation priorities (Amy, Sam, Carl; 45 min)

Goal: Identify issues the team needs to understand better from research and presentations

Addressed during earlier discussions

2:15 What's next (Amy, Sam, Carl; 15 min)

Goal: Identify action items, schedule recurring meetings.

Action Items (including ideas for future meetings):

1. Check on compatibility questions for DNR and Webform tool (Amy, Sam)
2. Reach out to Nick Balster (UW) and/or Daniel Yoder (U Tenn) to gauge interest in speaking to the group (Jeremy B.)
3. Contractors within the group prepare to share insights regarding practical elements of the tech standard from a contractor's perspective. (Mike Hackel, Phil Purpero)
4. Explore how other states handle storm water construction issues (Brent Jalonen)
5. For a future meeting – hear from regulators regarding thresholds for taking action (Carl Wepking will reach out to Eric Rortvedt and Pete Wood)
6. For future meeting – hear from Dane County how enforcement is handled (Jeremy B.)

Scheduling discussion–

- Avoid Tuesdays
- Thursdays are good
 - Decision – first Thursday of the month, July 2026 meeting is an exception
- Locations
 - Jeremy B. can help coordinate if we want to meet at the Dane county offices
 - DNR Fitchburg office is another possible location and easy access/parking

2:30 End

Ended early on account of incoming storm

Draft Schedule [updated 11 June 2026]

Date	Focus	Meeting Format
June 11, 2026	Kickoff, problem definition, goal setting, brainstorming, identify options	In Person
July 7, 2026	Presentations, discuss options, identify additional information needs	
August 6, 2026	Presentations/discussions/outline criteria	
September 3, 2026	Brainstorming/outline criteria	
October 1, 2026	Discuss new sections	
November 5, 2026	Discuss new sections	
December 3, 2026	Team review/discussion, select initial reviewers	
December 10, 2026	Send for internal/initial review	N/A-process step
January 7, 2027	Address initial review comments	Note: May need to reschedule or cancel to allow more time to process comments received
February 4, 2027	Finalize draft for public comment	
March 4, 2027	DNR request permission to post for public review	N/A-process step
April 1, 2027	Post for public comment	N/A-process step
May 6, 2027	Respond to public comments	Note: May need to reschedule or cancel to allow more time to process comments received
June 3, 2027	Review final draft	
July 2027	Request permission to finalize/Publish final technical standard	N/A-process step
August 2027	Webinar	Virtual