

**Summary of discussions during SHC Workshop Meeting on Feb 9, 2005, regarding SHC Preface to the Water Quality Protection Plan**

1. The attendees were:

- Neighborhood Interests: Karen Ford
- Concerned Citizens: none
- Property Owners: Henry Brooks  
Ira Yates
- Economic Interests: Joe Day
- Development Interests: none
- Public Interests Orgs.: none
- Local Env./Good Gov.: Mark Gentle  
Charles O’Dell  
Dana Blanton
- Government Entities: Andrew Backus  
Charlie Johnson

2. The discussions are summarized in the following table:

Item #	Who Commented	Comment	Votes to Incl. in Pref.(of 10)
1.	Karen	Set specific goal for land conservation - 20K acres – perhaps more?	0
2.	Joe	Identify & target sensitive land for conserving. - means to do difficult to specify	0
3.	Henry	Steer away from specifics.	Na
4.	Henry	Amend 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph to read: “... flow past us. <del>The waters in our streams .... “owned” by anyone. Rather,</del> We must collectively...”	Na
5.	Joe	Need to target the audience that we need to sell to (local govt. & citizens). What does local govt. need to know? - budget impact - legal risk & assoc. costs - citizen views	Na
6.	Charles	Lots of media attention will surround delivery of plan.	Na
7.	Charles	Need show parameters (e.g., same details listed as what local govt. wants to know)	Na
8.	Charles	Austin Mayor’s proposal for bond election to buy conservation land - we can project conservation land needs based on projected build out under plan	Na

9.	Charles	Recognize ECT results supportive of Plan - “Protect open space in hill country/aquifer” - “not business as usual”	Na
10.	Charles	Need for companion document with summary of impacts and results	Na
11.	Charles	Mention that Plan is “community based”	9
12.	Mark	Our charge was to have “implementable” plan - implementable-must be defensible based on: -- science -- legal -- consensus -- community based -- fair (sharing of burdens and benefits)	Na
13.	Mark	This is a unique area requiring unique actions. What is unique?: - eco-region based - not political boundaries - community based - consensus based - drainage basin/watershed - No Net Increase goal adopted - Replicable model for employment elsewhere as a process - most studied aquifer = best data - aquifer most threatened by growth  Karen: “In the PR Business, this is called a “Unique selling proposition.” ”  Mark: “A vulnerability will be drawing conclusions based on data from other regions.”  Mark: “Pioneering”, “Call to action”, “Obligation to act”	10
14.	Charles	Put positive face on difficult issues	Na
15.	Dana	Importance of coherent/regional action – emphasize the Big Picture and stress overall action (see unique features above)	Na
16.	Karen	Mention region	Na
17.	Charles	This is a model for others to apply	Na
18.	Mark	Say that the goal is No Net Increase	Na
19.	Joe	Set in historical perspective: “Longstanding Public Concerns...”	Na
		AGREED REVISED STRUCTURE FOR SHC PREFACE: 1. You charged us to do this 2. We’ve done it 3. You take it and act on it 4. Here are the benefits if you implement it	
		OTHER ITEMS TO DISCUSS WITH NAISMITH 1. Need for a separate legal statement regarding legal basis and	

		defensibility, implementability 2. Need for a companion Impact Summary	
		CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT A STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE TRANSMITTAL LETTER: 1. Be more forceful than the Preface 2. State expectations for action 3. Coordinate content with Preface	