

SCHEDULE REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

A meeting of the Schedule Review Subcommittee was held as follows:

MEETING INFORMATION

Meeting Date and Time: **July 26, 2004, at 1:00 pm**

Meeting Location: Offices of Naismith Engineering, Inc., 600 West 8th Street, Suite 300 Austin, Texas 78701.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS

Present	Member	Representing
X	Robert Botto	Neighborhood Interests
X	Joe C. Day	Economic Interests
X	Jon Beall	Local Environmental Preservation/Good Governance Organizations
X	Hank Smith	Development Interests
X	Jim Phillips	Concerned Citizens
X	Tom "Smitty" Smith	Public Interest Organizations
X	Jack Goodman	Government Entities
X	Gene Lowenthal	Property Owners
X	Terry Tull	Executive Director
X	Tom Brown	NEI

OBSERVERS

Present	Member	Representing
X	Karen Hadden	Public Interest Organizations
X	David Fusilier	NEI

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome and Introduction

Executive Director Terry Tull and NEI's Project Manager Tom Brown welcomed the assembled subcommittee members. Subcommittee members introduced themselves. Terry Tull reiterated the tasks of the Subcommittee, and reminded the Subcommittee about the goals of the Water Quality Planning Project and the tasks of the Consultant. He emphasized that the purpose of the Schedule Review Subcommittee is to consider how to maximize the input and efficiency of the Stakeholders' participation in the planning process.

2. Subcommittee Discussions and Recommendations

The Subcommittee was asked to address three questions. The following paragraphs summarize the discussions pertaining to these three questions, and the resulting recommendations.

QUESTION 1: What changes, if any, are recommended to the Consultant's current plans for Stakeholder Committee participation in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of such participation?

DISCUSSION:

Meeting Agendas – meeting agendas were too heavy, especially with presentations from the Consulting Team. Members were concerned with information overload. The agendas of each individual meeting needed to have fewer items so the members of the Stakeholder Committee would have more time for meaningful discussion and decision-making.

Meeting Preparation – the Stakeholder Committee members would need to be adequately prepared for each meeting in order to make the best use of everyone's time. All handouts that need to be read or reviewed by the committee members needed to be posted on the web site as far in advance of the meeting as possible. In that connection, Tom Brown stated that the goal of the consultant team would be to post items on the web site two weeks in advance of the Stakeholder Meeting (only one week in advance of the scheduled 8/18/04 meeting). The consultant team should include a handout that makes it clear to the committee members what they need to do to prepare for the meeting. It was indicated that it would be a good idea for the consultant team to develop a list of thought-provoking questions for the committee members for each handout to be read/reviewed.

Web Presentations – the idea of using a form of web-site based presentations should be explored. The presentations would allow the Consulting Team to present information to stakeholders between the scheduled Stakeholder Committee meetings, thereby freeing up more time for members to discuss issues/items at the meetings.

Process Committee – the Stakeholder Committee should consider forming a Process Committee to deal with process issues that come up during the development of the plan, freeing the Stakeholder Committee to spend more time on the water quality portion of the plan.

Plan Outline – Some members suggested that an outline of the proposed plan should be developed and distributed to the Stakeholder Committee so they could get a better handle on what the plan would ultimately look like.

Meeting Locations – Some members suggested that meetings which involved intensive consensus-building and issue-resolution efforts should be scheduled at locations where the environment is most conducive to such activities.

Website Content - The consultant team asked the assembled members of the Stakeholder Committee to think about what additional information they would like to see on the web site. Also, they were asked to consider what type of policy should be put in place for posting documents received from individual stakeholders or stakeholder groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. The agenda for future meetings should be pared down and more time allowed during the meetings to discuss issues and reach consensus. To maintain progress, meetings should be held more frequently, and agenda items that are not finished should be carried over to the next meeting.**
- B. Materials for consideration by the Stakeholder Committee should be provided well in advance of the meetings, along with clear instructions on what Stakeholder Committee members need to do to prepare for the meeting and the actions to be taken.**
- C. The Consultant should explore and adopt methods to enable dialogue among Stakeholder Committee members, in advance of meetings, regarding the issues under consideration. Consideration should be given to tools such as: “WebEx” on-line interactive briefings; conference call briefings; on-line recorded video briefings; and enhanced use of the Project Website for Stakeholder dialogue and communication.**
- D. The Executive Director should establish a methodology to deal with process-related issues outside of the regular Stakeholder Committee meetings, such as a “Process Subcommittee” similar to the “Schedule Review Subcommittee.”**

QUESTION 2: Can the Consultant’s current schedule be accelerated without threatening the ability of the Stakeholder Committee to participate effectively, or threatening the quality of the final plan? If so, how would this be done and what would it cost?

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the need and the ability to speed up the planning process. Some members expressed a desire to have the project substantially complete by December 2004. Other members stated that the process should be moved along as quickly as practicable, but should not be rushed just to meet the current deadline for the LCRA’s pending decision on the Hamilton Pool Road water line.

RECOMMENDATION:

- E. 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.**

QUESTION 3: What is the proposed schedule for future Stakeholder Committee meetings?

DISCUSSION: Members discussed various issues related to scheduling the meetings, including the practical aspects of distributing meeting materials and ensuring the members were prepared for the meetings. Some members expressed a willingness to meet as often as every three weeks, while others felt that once every four weeks would keep up the momentum without overburdening the committee. In the interest of facilitating the scheduling of the meetings and establishing a regularity to the meetings, it was proposed that the meetings be held once a month on a fixed date.

RECOMMENDATION:

- F. The Stakeholder Committee should meet monthly, on the third Wednesday of every month, until the plan is complete.**

Meeting Handouts Provided:

- 1) Inter-Local Agreement between Governments to establish planning process;
- 2) Scope of Work from the Solicitation for the Consultant;
- 3) Outline for Future Activities of the Stakeholder Committee;
- 4) Contract Scope of Work Divided into Proposed Work Orders (approved by Joint Committees July 12, 2004);
- 5) Project Tasks and Overview of Planning Process;
- 6) Microsoft Project Schedule of Planning Process (by task);

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

APPROVAL

These minutes were approved, with changes, at the Stakeholder Committee meeting on _____.