

Regional Water Quality Planning Project
c/o City of Dripping Springs
P.O. Box 384
Dripping Springs, Texas 78620

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 10, 2004

To: Executive and Core Committees

From: Executive Director

RE: Executive Director's Stakeholder Committee Report for Aug 11, 2004

Introduction.

This report provides the views of the Executive Director regarding the establishment and activities of the newly formed Stakeholder Committee. This report was provided to the members of the Stakeholder Committee for their information and comment, prior to its submission.

The members of the Stakeholder Committee also were invited to attend the Combined Executive and Core Committees' meeting on August 11, and to provide their own individual views about the Stakeholder Committee.

At the last meeting of the Combined Committees, in response to a question from Alderman Hamilton, I stated that the Stakeholder Committee would be asked to develop a process whereby it could report directly to the Core Committee. The Stakeholder Committee was not able to take up this question in its first real meeting on July 21st. However, this is one of several process-related questions that the Stakeholder Committee will be asked to consider in the near future. I'll say more about these process issues in my report below.

Highlights.

Following are highlights of activities related to the **Stakeholder Committee** since the June 23rd meeting of the Core Committee:

1. **Stakeholder Committee Meetings:** There have been two **Stakeholder Committee Meetings** since June 23rd:
 - a. **June 30, 2004 - Stakeholder Committee Selection Meeting** (details on website: www.waterqualityplan.org)
 - i. Held at the Waldorf School
 - ii. 95 Stakeholders signed in
 - iii. Accomplishments:
 1. Informational presentations (copies on website):
 - a. Legal Issues
 - b. USFWS
 - c. TCEQ

2. Refined and “voted on” issues and goals
 3. Initial **Stakeholder Committee** Selections
 4. Meeting of provisional members of the **Stakeholder Committee**
- b. **July 21, 2004 – Stakeholder Committee Meeting** (details on website)
- i. Held at ACC, Pinnacle Campus
 - ii. Minor adjustments to **Stakeholder Committee** selections
 - iii. Accomplishments:
 1. Seated full **Committee** (membership list attached)
 2. Informational presentations (copies on website):
 - a. Stakeholder Issues Summary,
 - b. Government Entity Authorities,
 - c. Technical Bibliography,
 - d. Draft Plan Comparison Matrix
 3. Adopted Bylaws
 4. Appointed Schedule Review Subcommittee
2. **Stakeholder Committee Formation:**
- a. Stakeholder Category Groups selected 3 members plus 1 alternate on June 30
 - b. I asked all Stakeholders to advise if not represented on the **Committee**
 - c. Three main concerns and one secondary concern expressed by Stakeholders:
 - i. Insufficient representation of strong property rights views in the Property Owner category
 - ii. Insufficient geographical diversity in the Neighborhood category
 - iii. Multiple representatives from the same organizations in several categories may have deprived other views from being heard
 - iv. Additionally, no county government reps were named in the Local Government category.
 - d. Actions taken as a result:
 - i. Limited organizations to only one rep in a category group
 - ii. Added a 4th member for Property Owners, to be filled by a strong property rights landowner.
 - iii. Added a 4th member for Local Government, to be filled by a County Rep.
 - e. Required adjustments made by Stakeholders at July 21, 2004 **Stakeholder Committee** meeting
 - f. Two issues surfaced at July 21 meeting:
 - i. Should both counties be represented? - To be addressed at next **Stakeholder Committee** meeting
 - ii. Should there be a “Technical Stakeholder Group”? - To be addressed by a proposed standing Process Subcommittee.
3. **Communications:**
- a. E-mail remains the main method of communication in “real time” - approx 525 addresses on our contact list

- b. Website (www.waterqualityplan.org) is our main way of distributing documents for information and review.
- c. Category Groups of the **Stakeholder Committee** are beginning to set up Yahoo Groups for internal communications.
- d. Considerable coverage in local newspapers.

4. **Project Schedule Considerations:**

- a. **Schedule Review Subcommittee** was formed to consider:
 - i. How to ensure **Stakeholder Committee** effectiveness in the planning process,
 - ii. Whether the current schedule can be accelerated without threatening the **Stakeholder Committee's** role in the planning process, and
 - iii. What is the proposed schedule of future meetings?
- b. Recommendations of the **Schedule Review Subcommittee** will be considered at the **Stakeholder Committee** meeting on Aug 18. Here is a summary:
 - i. Meet once a month (3rd Wed at 6:00 pm)
 - ii. Reduce the agenda and allow more time for dialogue and consensus.
 - iii. Provide materials and assignments in advance to prepare for meetings.
 - iv. Provide means to facilitate dialogue among **Committee** members.
 - v. Deal with “process-related” issues outside of meetings
 - vi. “The **Stakeholder Committee** and the Consultant should work diligently to complete the Water Quality Protection Plan as quickly as possible, without jeopardizing the quality of the final product. However, it is NOT recommended that the work be accelerated for the sole purpose of delivering a product in time to influence the LCRA Hamilton Pool Road water line decision in December. In the interest of helping LCRA make that decision, the Subcommittee recommends that a preliminary report be submitted to LCRA by December 1, 2004, providing any information that is deemed to be helpful to LCRA in making decisions about future waterline extensions.”

5. **Process-Related Issues:**

- a. To help me address “process-related” issues outside of the regular meetings of the Stakeholder Committee, I will ask the Committee to establish a standing Process Subcommittee, with one representative from each of the eight category groups, at the meeting on Aug 18.
- b. Initial issues for the Subcommittee to consider include:
 - i. How the Stakeholder Committee should report to the Core Committee
 - ii. How the Stakeholder Committee should involve outside technical expertise in the Stakeholder Process
 - iii. How to define when “consensus” is achieved
 - iv. How to facilitate dialogue among Stakeholders outside of meetings

Conclusion.

I believe we have established a **Stakeholder Committee** that is representative of the many interests across the planning region. The size of the **Committee** is small enough to be

manageable (26 members) but large and broad enough to adequately represent the many different interests in our process.

The **Stakeholder Committee** understands that we are seeking a **consensus-based** outcome, and that all the Stakeholder points of view must be heard if this is to be achieved.

The **Stakeholder Committee** representatives have exhibited a seriousness and dedication to this effort that is impressive and inspirational, and which give me confidence that we will be successful.

Respectfully submitted,

--- signed ---

Terry Tull

Attachment: Stakeholder Committee Members

Cc: Stakeholder Committee Members
Naismith Engineering

STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES -E-MAIL LIST

The following table is a list of the Stakeholder Committee Representatives as determined by actions of the Stakeholder Category Breakout Groups at the June 30, 2004 and July 21, 2004 Stakeholders Meetings.

Stakeholder Category	Representatives	E-mail Address	Affiliation
Neighborhood Interests	Robbie Botto Karen Ford Hugh Winkler Randall Thomas (Alt.)	robbie.botto@ci.austin.tx.us klford@austin.rr.com hughw@hughw.net rthomas@varco.com	Barton Hills Neighborhood Assn. NBRNA & FA HPRSCC La Tierra de los Pedernales
Concerned Citizens	Jim Phillips J.T. Stewart David Venhuizen Bret Raymis (Alt.)	jimphillips@imagicmail.com stewbagel@hotmail.com waterguy@ix.netcom.com braymis@yahoo.com	Self Self Self Self
Property Owners / Agricultural Interest	Henry Brooks S. Tim Casey Gene Lowenthal Ira Yates Carlotta McLean (Alt.)	hbrosks10@aol.com timcasey@texas.net gene@lowenthal.net Yatespct3@aol.com carlotta@texas.net	Self Self Self/HPRSCC Self Self & others
Economic Interests (Note: only 1 permanent alternate will be named.)	Joe C. Day Randy Robinson Michael Waite John Mikels (Temp. Alt) S.H. Snyder (Temp. Alt)	JoeCDay@msn.com randy@randyrobinson.com michael@drippingspringsrealty.com geos-jkm@swbell.net tsnyder@snyderhomes.com	Wimberley Economic Development Dripping Springs Chamber of Commerce Self & Real Estate GEOS Consulting Realtor
Development Interests	Rebecca Hudson Bryan Jordan Hank Smith Chris Risher (Alt.)	rebhudson@aol.com bjordan@jonescarter.com hsmith@cfaulknerengineering.com chris@headwatersdevelopment.com	Self RECA/Jones & Carter HBA Headwaters Dev. Co./Hays Co. Developer
Public Interest Organizations	Colin Clark Karen Hadden Tom "Smitty" Smith Donna Tiemann (Alt.)	colin@sosalliance.org karen@seedcoalition.org smitty@citizen.org donna@austinaction.org	SOS Alliance & GEAA Self/SEED Coalition Public Citizen Sierra Club
Local Environmental Preservation/Good Governance Organizations	Jon Beall Mark Gentle Charles O'Dell Mike Lyday (Alt)	jbeall@tdiaustin.com jmgentle@aol.com codell@austin.rr.com mike.lyday@ci.austin.tx.us	Save Barton Creek Association Barton Springs Swimmers Hays Community Action Network Scientists
Government Entities	Andrew Backus Nancy McClintock Alan Bojorquez Dede Stevenson Jack Goodman (Alt)	aback@austin.rr.com nancy.mcclintock@ci.austin.tx.us alan@texasmunicipallawyers.com dstevenson3@austin.rr.com JackGoodman2@aol.com	HTGCD City of Austin City of Dripping Springs Hays County BSESACD