THE BENEFITS OF POLYACRYLAMIDE (PAM) to reduce erosion in furrow irrigation systems have been well documented. In fact, the use of PAM is considered a best management practice by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and is included in the NRCS’ National Handbook of Conservation Practices (NRCS, 2001). Furrow irrigation rates of PAM as low as 1.00 lb/acre dissolved in furrow irrigation water may be efficient in reducing sediment, phosphorus, and nitrogen losses by 85-99%. The benefits in crop growth have also been documented.

Testing of PAM for erosion control on steep slopes suggests that application rates will need to be higher compared to the rates found to be successful in furrow irrigation. Tests using less than 20 lb PAM per acre have generally had no statistically significant reduction in erosion rates. It should be noted that in these studies there were substantial reductions in sediment losses or runoff turbidity as a result of the PAM treatments, but high variability resulted in few statistical differences.

Substantially higher PAM rates have been shown to be effective, however. Rates of 20 – 80 lb/acre have resulted in reductions in erosion and sometimes runoff volumes. Unfortunately, most studies have been conducted with no mulch, which is not typical of slope stabilization approaches commonly used. Since vegetative cover is usually the objective, a mulch would normally be applied to encourage germination and seedling establishment.

The longevity of PAM benefits in reducing runoff and erosion from the time of application is an important management question. There appears to be no set answer, but longevity is affected by application rate, slope, and environmental conditions. Lower application rates will usually not last as long, perhaps only for the first several events. Rates of 60-80 lb/acre have been found to last over many storm events. Applications in areas of the country with low rainfall or regular dry periods will last longer than those in the eastern U.S.

There has been little work to determine the effects of PAM on the establishment and growth of vegetation, usually grass, used to stabilize slopes. The two studies available did generally indicate that grass growth was improved, but the results were not very impressive. In theory, if erosion is reduced and infiltration is improved, it should follow that grass growth is better.

It is also important to note that PAM may be applied at rates which can reduce infiltration. One study indicated greatly reduced infiltration rates with PAM applications above 87 lb/acre as a solution or at 58 lb/acre as a powder applied to a wet soil surface. There is even some indication that PAM could be used to reduce infiltration in irrigation ditches and canals.

Recent Tests in North Carolina

As part of a larger project to evaluate methods to reduce water quality impacts of large transportation projects, we established test plots on different slopes to determine PAM and mulch material effects. The study was initiated in February 2006 and finished in June 2006, during which we established 18 treatment plots in four locations on NC DOT construction projects. One location was just east of Raleigh, NC and the other three were in different locations on a project north of Charlotte, NC. Each site was prepared by a commercial seeding contractor according to NC DOT specifications, including 4,000 lb/acre lime, 500 lb/acre fertilizer (10-20-20), and a seed mix appropriate for the location, generally fescue, Bermuda, and centipede. The exception was Site 3, where lespedeza was used as is the custom for temporary seeding in the summer.

We tested different combinations of products with or without PAM. These included straw + tackifier, excelsior matting, and a... continued on page 2
Polyacrylamide Reduces Erosion on Construction Site Slopes

continued from page 1

bonded fiber matrix hydromulch, Flexterra. The PAM treatment consisted of 33 lb/acre of Applied Polymer Systems 705 powder, applied using a hydroseeder or in the mix for the hydromulches. As an indication of the quality of runoff from the plots, we installed runoff collectors on each plot (Figure 1). These were very simple in design, with barriers inserted into the soil to divert a portion of the plot runoff into pipes leading to 5 gallon buckets. We did not intend for the results to provide quantitative information about total runoff or sediment loads, but as indicators of runoff quality and erosion losses. After plot establishment, between three and six storm events were monitored at each site and the average is presented here. We also estimated vegetative cover using at least three observers, whose estimates were averaged for each plot.

Results

The conditions varied but were typical for establishing vegetative cover on construction projects, with periods of drought and warm temperatures creating difficult conditions for seedling growth. All four sites were cut slopes, but the seedbed materials were highly variable.

Straw and tackifier is the standard mulch system used on many construction sites. At all four sites, the turbidity from the straw plots was reduced substantially with the addition of PAM (Table 1). Runoff turbidity was generally highest in the straw plots compared to the other mulches, and the addition of PAM often brought turbidity down within the range of the best treatments. This suggests that in many cases adding PAM to a good straw cover could result in performance similar to much more expensive systems. Excelsior matting was tested for PAM response at three of the four locations and it had a less dramatic reduction in runoff turbidity, but still measurable. The two sites where wood hydromulch was tested had very different results, with a large turbidity reduction with PAM at Site 1 and a slight increase in turbidity at Site 4.

The bonded fiber matrix (BFM) hydromulch was only tested at one site in this study, but it had a 77% overall reduction in turbidity. It should be noted that the turbidity from this mulch treatment was much less than any other, with or without PAM.

The estimated erosion rates for the plots had patterns very similar to the turbidity responses to PAM applications (Table 2). However, in several instances the PAM effects were more dramatic due to a lower volume of water coming from the treated plots. We have not been able to document this consistently, but PAM can have the effect of increasing infiltration by maintaining soil structure during storm events.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cover Type</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>Erosion Rate Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Hydromulch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexterra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Effects of PAM on runoff turbidity for different cover types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cover Type</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>Erosion Rate Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straw</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Hydromulch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexterra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Effects of PAM on erosion rates for different cover types.
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There were no obvious responses to PAM in grass growth on the plots (data not presented). We will continue to look for measurable improvements since less erosion and more infiltration should favor grass growth, but thus far we have not observed significant effects.

Conclusions

The benefits of PAM applications in agricultural settings has been very well documented, but typical construction site settings are much more challenging and require different recommendations. A review of PAM application rates on slopes from 5 – 45% suggests that at least 20 lb/acre is needed for a consistent reduction in erosion rates, and that higher rates are needed on steeper slopes. Significant reductions in erosion rates and runoff volumes are usually reported. Most previous studies have been performed on bare soil, but recent results of our studies have suggested that PAM is beneficial when combined with typical mulch materials. We have found that this is true for the common ground cover types used on construction sites. The performance of straw with PAM at 33 lb/acre sometimes met or exceeded that of matting and wood fiber hydromulch. Improvements in vegetation establishment have not been as evident as reductions in erosion and runoff turbidity.

Three Counties Approved as New Local Erosion and Sediment Control Programs

The Sedimentation Control Commission (SCC) met most recently on February 15, 2007, in the Ground Floor Hearing Room of the Archdale Building in Raleigh, NC. At this meeting, the Commission delegated implementation of the Sedimentation Pollution Control Act (SPCA) to three new local programs: Caldwell County, Henderson County, and Lincoln County. Local program staff will perform plan reviews and enforce compliance of plans within their jurisdictions. Each of these three programs was also awarded start-up funds of $33,785 from the Sedimentation Control Commission. Funds will be used for a variety of needs, including salary, equipment, and vehicles.

In order to be awarded delegation, each local program must adopt a local erosion and sedimentation control ordinance, which is evaluated and found to be at least as restrictive as the model ordinance of the State and in compliance with all requirements of the Sedimentation Pollution Control Act. If you are involved in erosion and sediment control work in any of these three counties, or any other local government with delegated authority under the SCC, then you should be familiar with the approved local ordinance. While these ordinances must be at least as restrictive as the state requirements, they may be more restrictive.

To reach any of the new local programs, please contact the appropriate person below:

Caldwell County (estimated to begin October 1, 2007)
Bill Duquette, P.E.
County Environmental Engineer
1051 Harper Avenue SW
Lenoir, NC 28645
Phone: (828) 757-6860
Fax: (828) 757-6864
billd@caldwellcountync.org

Henderson County (estimated to begin October 1, 2007)
Samuel Laughter, CZO
Director of Building Services
101 East Allen Street
Hendersonville, NC 28792
Phone: (828) 697-4525
Fax: (828) 698-6185
saml@hendersoncountync.org

Lincoln County (estimated to begin May 1, 2007)
Rick McSwain
Natural Resources Conservationist
115 West Main Street
Lincolnton, NC 28092
Phone: (704) 736-8501
Fax: (704) 736-8504
rmcsain@lincolncounty.org

Current contact information for other delegated local programs may be found at the link below. Also available at that location is the most recent Model Ordinance approved by the SCC, as well as information about the procedure for starting your own local program. http://dlr.env.state.nc.us/pages/sedimentlocalprograms.html
**Sediment and Erosion Control Workshop in Western North Carolina**

Sarah Carter
Americorps
North Carolina Arboretum

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE University (NCSU) Water Quality Group in coordination with the NCSU Soil and Water Environmental Technology Center held a “Sediment and Erosion Control Workshop for Contractors” on February 20, 2007, at the North Carolina Arboretum in Asheville. Funding for this workshop was provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Clean Water Act Section 319 program. The workshop was tailored to address the specific issues contractors face concerning sediment and erosion in the mountains. Seventy-six attendees, mostly contractors, surveyors, professional engineers, and landscapers, learned the basics of how to appropriately control onsite erosion.

As the lead instructor, Dr. Richard McLaughlin compared the uses and effectiveness of a wide range of erosion control technologies, ranging from different types of ground cover to the use of polyacrylamide (PAM) in silt bags. He also highlighted changes to the Erosion and Sediment Control Manual, and what that means for contractors. In addition to Dr. McLaughlin, Jason Zink and Steve Foster from NCSU Water Quality Group spoke about how land use changes affect water quality and why sediment and erosion control is important. Representing NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NC DENR), Laurie Moorhead expounded upon the role of the regulator and the regulator’s perspective.

In the afternoon, many of the technologies covered in the lectures were demonstrated at a construction site on the NC Arboretum’s campus. Silt bags, live staking, reinforced matting, and a level spreader were installed and pumped with muddy water so that attendees could see these technologies in action. More information on this workshop can be found at the following website:

http://www.bae.ncsu.edu/programs/extension/wqg/frenchbroad/sediment_workshop.html

**International Certified Erosion, Sediment and Storm Water Inspector Certification Program (CESSWI)**

David Ward, Executive Director
CPESC, Inc.

The CERTIFIED PROFESSIONALS in Erosion and Sediment Control (CPESC), Inc. is excited to announce the development of its Certified Erosion, Sediment and Storm Water Inspector Certification Program (CESSWI). This new program will be available to all qualified technicians and inspectors who wish to demonstrate their proficiencies in construction and post construction inspection skills and abilities. This new designation for certified specialists was created by CPESC, Inc., in conjunction with a national oversight committee of erosion and sediment control and storm water management professionals.

This unique program will make it possible for both the regulators and the regulated community to employ qualified inspection staff to observe and report the adequacy of erosion and sediment controls and storm water management for construction, industrial and municipal operations. Persons with the CESSWI certification will be recognized throughout the United States and Canada as candidates who have demonstrated the minimum proficiencies needed to inspect construction and post construction Best Management Practices. Specific state requirements may be added to the certification process.

To apply, a candidate must provide information on education and applicable work experience. Applicants will be reviewed by a qualifications committee and notified of their eligibility to sit for an examination. An Inspector Study Course will be available for those who want to sharpen their skills prior to the exam.

**For more information contact:**
David Ward
www.cpesc.org
david@cpesc.org
(828) 655-1600

**For more information on Sediment and Erosion Control, please visit:**
NC Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources - Land Quality Section
www.dlr.enr.state.nc.us/pages/landqualitysection.html
International Erosion Control Association
www.ieca.org
In Part I of our series on Low Impact Development (LID), we introduced the concepts and tenets of the practice and contrasted it with conventional development. We also broached the subject of incorporating LID into local ordinances and state codes.

A few years ago, I participated in the first National Low Impact Development Conference in Maryland. The conference was hosted by Prince George’s County, Maryland and other progressive LID advocates. Having worked in a local government setting for a number of years, I must say that I had reservations with regard to developers and their desire to design and construct sites using environmentally-friendly practices. I always had in mind that most developers had little or no desire to use low impact development. However, by participating in the LID conference in Maryland, I had my first opportunity to hear the developers’ perspective on the issue.

One developer, as a presenter at the conference, noted that developers focus on three major concepts when planning a development – time, value, and money. These three concepts are critical to the success of the project. He said that he desired to use low impact development. However, under the active regulations at that time, it took him about a year to gain approval for the LID-based plan in contrast to the conventional type, which would have taken about 30 days for approval. So, let’s see. If time, value, and money were the founding principles of your project, and it took 11 times the amount of time to gain approval for a low impact development than a conventional development for the same project, which approach would you choose? Does this not cause us to question the various perspectives on environmental projects, particularly those pertaining to low impact development?

I have conducted preliminary research on this topic:

**Developer’s Perspective**
- Minimize risks
- Maximize profit
- Minimize time (permitting, etc.)
- Maximize value
- Minimize issues of “surprise”
- Satisfy clients/customers

**Local Government’s Perspective**
- Minimize risks
- Minimize short and long-range expenses
- Enforce environmental regulations
- Performance of integrated management practices
- Protection of landowners

There are various perspectives and several parties involved in the design, construction, and implementation phases of a given project. How can we mesh the various perspectives into a low impact development program? What groups should participate in a process that focuses on these perspectives? What could be the end result of a forum on perspectives? Perhaps the end result will be a statewide catalyst for low impact development. We will discuss this in more detail in a later article.

Returning to the developer at the LID conference in Maryland, his year-long wait for project approval was essentially caused by antiquated ordinances – ordinances that inhibited and discouraged low impact development.

NCSU and Cooperative Extension are currently working on some initiatives to address antiquated ordinances. Some projects in the works include a North Carolina LID Design Manual (contact Laura Spzir at laura_spzir@ncsu.edu for information on this subject), an alternative LID ordinance, amending local ordinances to encourage LID, and a developers forum.

To schedule a low impact development training seminar or receive more information on the subject matter contained in this article, please contact Dwane Jones at 252.747.5831 or dwane_jones@ncsu.edu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Level II: Erosion &amp; Sediment Control/ Stormwater Certification for NC DOT Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hickory, NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bae.ncsu.edu/workshops/dot/leveliioverview.html">www.bae.ncsu.edu/workshops/dot/leveliioverview.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17-18/07</td>
<td>Stormwater Treatment Practice Inspection &amp; Maintenance Taxonomy and Certification</td>
<td>Durham, NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24-25/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/07</td>
<td>Erosion &amp; Sediment Control Workshop</td>
<td>Wake Forest, NC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wakeforestnc.gov/residents/engineering_erosionandsedimentcontrol.aspx">http://www.wakeforestnc.gov/residents/engineering_erosionandsedimentcontrol.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>