

STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - draft

A meeting of the Stakeholder committee was held as follows:

MEETING INFORMATION

Meeting Date and Time: **July 21, 2004, at 7:00 pm**

Meeting Location: Austin Community College Pinnacle Campus, 7748 U.S. Highway 290, Austin, Travis County, Texas 78737, Room 108.

ATTENDEES

Present	Member	Present	Member
X	Andrew Backus	X	Gene Lowenthal
X	Jon Beall	X	Nancy McClintock
	Allen Bojorquez	X	Charles O' Dell
X	Robert (Robbie) Botto	X	Jim Phillips
X	Henry Brooks	X (part)	Randy Robinson
X	S. Tim Casey	X	Hank Smith
X	Colin Clark	X	Tom (Smitty) Smith
X	Joe C. Day	X	Dede Stevenson
X	Karen Ford	X	J. T. Stewart
X	Mark Gentle	X	David Venhuizen
X	Karen Hadden		Michael Waite
X	Rebecca Hudson	X	Hugh Winkler
X	Bryan Jordan	X	Ira Yates
Present	Alternate	Present	Alternate
X	Jack Goodman	X	Chris Risher
X	Mike Lyday	X	S.H. (Tary) Snyder
X	Carlotta McClean	X	Randall Thomas
X	John Mikels	X	Donna Tiemann
X	Bret Raymis		
Present	Staff/Consultants	Present	Staff/Consultants
X	Terry Tull – Executive Director	X	Leonard Olson - GCA
X	Tom Brown – NEI	X	Steve Dickman - KHH
X	Grant Jackson – NEI	X	Roy Frye – H&C
X	David Fusilier - NEI	X	Joe Vickers - ESW

CALL TO ORDER

Executive Director Terry Tull served as Coordinator for the meeting, and Grant Jackson of the NEI Consulting Team served as the Secretary for the meeting. Coordinator Tull called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Secretary Jackson performed a roll call of members present, as outlined in the table above.

SPECIAL ITEM

Prior to convening the Stakeholder Committee meeting, individual meetings of the following stakeholder categories were convened at 6:00 p.m. to revise the representation to the Stakeholder Committee: Neighborhood Interests, Property Owners/Agricultural Interests, Development Interests, Local Environmental Preservation/Good Governance Organizations, and Government Entities. The revisions are reflected on the Stakeholder Committee List, a copy of which is attached.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Opening Remarks

Coordinator Terry Tull welcomed and thanked all of the Stakeholder Committee representatives and alternates for their time and participation, and addressed several administrative items.

2. Stakeholder Committee Representation

As notified prior to the meeting, and as identified during the individual meetings of several of the Stakeholder categories, Coordinator Terry Tull reviewed the revised list of representatives and alternates. There were several questions regarding the make-up of the committee. A suggestion was offered by two (2) representatives that an additional seat be added on the Committee, representing Government Entities, for Travis County, since Hays County had a new representative on the Committee and since Travis County's involvement would be integral to implementation. After discussion of this issue, the consensus of the committee was to have Terry Tull coordinate this issue with Hays and Travis Counties, and to make no formal action at this time to add a seat to the Committee.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the June 30, 2004 Meeting

Coordinator Terry Tull reviewed previously posted copies of the minutes from the June 30, 2004 meeting. The minutes were approved by consensus of the group after several suggested changes to the names, affiliations and attendance of the committee members, and the deletion of a duplicate paragraph.

4. Bylaws

Coordinator Terry Tull reviewed copies of the bylaws that had previously been presented and posted for the Committee. Coordinator Tull also presented some requested changes to Article II, Section 1 of the Bylaws dealing with the number and role of the Committee representatives and alternates. A clarification question arose over Article IV, Section 1, regarding whether meetings of the stakeholder categories or subgroups were required to be open to the public.

Secretary Jackson and Coordinator Tull indicated that meetings of the Stakeholder Committee and any formal sub-committees of the Stakeholder Committee would need to be handled as open public meetings. However, while informal stakeholder interest groups were encouraged to make their meetings open to the public, this would not be required by the Bylaws. An extensive discussion took place regarding Article VI, Section 2, regarding whether or not a “three-fourths” majority was appropriate for situations where the Committee could not achieve consensus. A few of the representatives requested that this be changed to a simple majority. However, other representatives indicated that the “three-fourths” majority would be appropriate, and that votes should seldom, if ever be required. At the conclusion of the discussion, the consensus of the Committee was to leave the “three-fourths” majority in place. Although Committee Member Karen Hadden voiced her dissent to the three-fourths majority rule, she acceded to the group decision so that the bylaws could be adopted. The Bylaws were approved by the consensus of the Committee, incorporating the proposed changes suggested by Coordinator Tull. The amended Bylaws will be posted on the project website.

5. Stakeholder Issues Summary

Tom Brown, of the consulting team, made a presentation and reviewed a previously posted handout on the results of the “dot voting” on issues and challenges from the June 30, 2004 stakeholder meeting. Mr. Brown responded to several questions from the Committee. Mr. Brown’s presentation will be posted to the project website.

6. Governmental Entity Authority Briefing

Steve Dickman, of the consulting team, made a presentation and reviewed a previously posted handout on the existing legal authorities of major governmental entities in the planning region. Mr. Dickman responded to several questions from the Committee. Mr. Dickman’s presentation will be posted to the project website.

7. Governmental Entity Authority Briefing

Roy Frye and Grant Jackson, of the consulting team, made a presentation and reviewed a previously posted handout on the technical information bibliography being prepared for the development of the water quality protection plan. Mr. Frye and Mr. Jackson responded to several questions from the Committee. One representative indicated a series of technical references that he felt should be added to the bibliography, and indicated that he would forward this information to the consulting team via e-mail. Another representative distributed copies of two documents that he indicated he would like to have considered for inclusion in the bibliography. Mr. Jackson requested the Committee review the bibliography, distribute it to any technical resources they deemed appropriate, and either bring any suggested revisions for discussion at the next meeting or forward those suggestions to the consulting team via e-mail.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Distribution of Contact Information

Coordinator Terry Tull reminded the Committee about previous discussions regarding the distribution of their contact information as follows: 1) the contact information for the representatives and alternates for each stakeholder category would be distributed to individuals who have signed-in or indicated their desire to participate in that stakeholder category, and 2)

the contact information for each representative and alternates would be distributed to the Committee. No objections were expressed to this policy.

2. Project Schedule

Coordinator Terry Tull initiated a discussion on accelerating the proposed schedule for completion of the regional water quality plan. Several comments were offered indicating that it was important to complete the process prior to the Lower Colorado River Authority's (LCRA) proposed action on the Hamilton Pool Road waterline in December, 2004. Other comments were offered indicating that the process should not be artificially rushed to meet a specific deadline. Consulting team member Grant Jackson reviewed a previously posted outline of the anticipated future steps in the process and how each of the agenda items in the current meeting related to proposed actions at future meetings. In response to a question about expediting the process, Mr. Jackson indicated that the consultant's work could be expedited, but the critical path items on the schedule were the frequency of the stakeholder meetings, and the progress made at those meetings. Coordinator Tull requested volunteers from each stakeholder category to form a Schedule Review Subcommittee to review the Stakeholder participation process and establish a more firm schedule. The Schedule Review Subcommittee will meet in the offices of Naismith Engineering on Monday, July 26th at 1:00 pm. The following Stakeholder Committee volunteers were named to serve on the Schedule Review Subcommittee:

- Robbie Botto (Neighborhood Interests)
- Jim Phillips (Concerned Citizens)
- Gene Lowenthal (Landowners)
- Joe C. Day (Economic Interests)
- Hank Smith (Development Interests) (name provided following the meeting)
- Tom Smith (Public Interest Organizations)
- Jon Beall (Local Environmental/Good Governance)
- Jack Goodman (Local Government)

Further action on modifying the schedule was tabled until the next meeting.

Coordinator Terry Tull also initiated a discussion on the location, date and time for the next meeting, and suggested August 18, 2004. A few representatives indicated that this date would not be convenient and offered an alternative date. However, a larger number of representatives indicated that the alternative date would not be convenient and the consensus of the group was to have the meeting on August 18th and to begin at 6:00 pm. Several representatives expressed concerns about the size of the meeting room and the need to provide additional space for the alternates and observers. Coordinator Tull indicated that the ACC Pinnacle campus seemed to be convenient, but that he would investigate other venues.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 pm.

APPROVAL

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