

STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - draft

A meeting of the Stakeholder committee was held as follows:

MEETING INFORMATION

Meeting Date and Time: **January 11, 2005, at 6:00 pm**

Meeting Location: Oak Hill United Methodist Church, 7815 U.S. Highway 290 West, Austin, Travis County, Texas 78736.

ATTENDEES

Present	Member	Present	Member
X	Andrew Backus	X	Gene Lowenthal
X	Jon Beall		Nancy McClintock
	Alan Bojorquez		Charles O' Dell
X	Robert (Robbie) Botto		Jim Phillips
X	Henry Brooks		Randy Robinson
	S. Tim Casey	X	Hank Smith
X	Colin Clark		Tom (Smitty) Smith
X	Joe C. Day	X	J. T. Stewart
	Karen Ford		Jon Thompson
X	David Fowler	X	David Venhuizen
	Mark Gentle		Michael Waite
	Karen Hadden	X	Hugh Winkler
	Rebecca Hudson		Ira Yates
X	Bryan Jordan		
Present	Alternate	Present	Alternate
X	Jack Goodman		Chris Risher
X	Dana Blanton	X	S.H. (Tary) Snyder
	Carlotta McLean		Randall Thomas
X	Bret Raymis	X	Donna Tiemann
Present	Staff/Consultants	Present	Staff/Consultants
X	Terry Tull – Executive Director	X	Tom Brown – NEI
X	Grant Jackson – NEI	X	David Fusilier – NEI

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 approximately 6:05 p.m. Mr. Tull performed a roll call of members present, as outlined in the table above.

[TABLE BELOW IS FROM 1/11/05 MEETING AGENDA DOCUMENT]

AGENDA - for the January 11, 2005 Stakeholder Committee Meeting:

Time	Activity
6:00 pm	Convene Stakeholder Committee Meeting, Opening Remarks, Roll Call – Terry Tull
6:05 pm	Open Public Comment
6:10 pm	Discussion and Action to approve Minutes of December 15, 2004 Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Terry Tull (See attachment 1)
6:15 pm	Review, Discuss and Approve Updated Project Schedule and Milestones, and Schedule of Remaining Stakeholder Committee Meetings (including any necessary subcommittee meetings) – Terry Tull/NEI (See attachment 2)
7:00 pm	Present the 3 rd Draft Version of the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan - NEI (See attachment 3)
7:30 pm	Break
7:40 pm	(Break into Sub-Groups?) Discuss and answer the following questions to guide the Consultant’s work to complete the Water Quality Protection Plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Standard for Selecting Water Quality Protection Measures? 2. Where are the Measures to be Applied?
9:20 pm	Other Business (set next meeting dates, next meeting agenda, etc...)
9:30 pm	Adjourn

1. Open Public Comment Period.

Mr. Henry Brooks (SHC Member – Property Owners) addressed the SHC and handed out a USDA publication titled “Grazing Lands – A Valuable Resource For All Texans”.

2. Discussion and Action to Approve Minutes from the December 15, 2004 Stakeholder Committee Meeting (Meeting Attachment No. 1).

Coordinator Tull reviewed the previously posted copies of the minutes from the December 15, 2004 Stakeholder Committee (SHC) Meeting. The minutes were approved by consensus without changes.

3. Review and Discussion of the Proposed Meeting Schedule for the Remainder of the Project (Meeting Attachment No. 2a and 2b).

Coordinator Tull presented the latest updated Project Schedule. Coordinator Tull indicated that much work has already been done on The Plan, but there is a lot to be accomplished in a relatively short amount of time. He stated that to get The Plan completed by the February deadline, it will likely take multiple SHC meetings, and possibly necessitate the formation of subcommittees to resolve certain issues. The schedule for the next SHC Meeting was discussed and it was agreed to that the SHC would meet next Wednesday, January 19, 2005. A schedule was outlined that would have the SHC meeting weekly (at least according to the tentative schedule) in an attempt to address the outstanding issues and have a consensus based plan that could be presented to the Executive and Core Committees at their Wednesday, February 23, 2005 meeting.

4. Review and Discussion of the 3rd Draft Version of the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan (Meeting Attachment No. 3).

Grant Jackson/NEI reviewed the 3rd Draft Version of the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan with a PowerPoint presentation.

During and after Mr. Jackson’s presentation, the SHC members were given an opportunity to comment on the 3rd Draft of The Plan. The comments received from the individual SHC members in attendance at the meeting are summarized below:

Implementation

- The plan needs to describe how things will work with regard to implementation (first – locally?; second – regionally?).
- Just because a regional entity would take legislative action doesn’t mean we shouldn’t try to do it.
- TCEQ has the authority – we should start with their rules and change them as we see fit.
- It is not a bad idea for all the entities to approach their elected officials and ask for legislative action.

General

- Eutrophication is important. BMPs cannot address this issue.
- We haven’t set a standard. How do you set background levels on existing streams?
- How do we address “enhancing”?

Development of a Regional Water Quality Protection Plan for the Barton Springs Segment of the Edwards Aquifer and its Contributing Zone

- Small increases result in a cumulative problem.
- We need to outline what a “non-degradation” policy really is.
- Monitoring needs to be part of the plan (monitor constructed BMPs?).
- Stream background quality needs to be specified.
- “Adaptive management model” – one should be created.
- Developer and engineer need to know if there is a problem, that they may need to fix it.
- We need to see where water quality data has been taken and what that data says.
- Test the stream first, then test after development.
- We may need to make specific recommendations for additional monitoring for certain constituents that we don’t have.
- Mixing “performance-based” standards with “design-based” standards – this is not good.
- Do not understand the mix between design and performance based standards (you can monitor for a site, but do not see how you do it for a watershed).
- If we aim for 100% removal of the increased pollutant load, we may get 90 % (real world).
- The plan needs to be specific how to calculate pre- and post-development conditions.
- The plan needs to accommodate the evaluation of BMPs (like looking at BMPs and adjusting the removal efficiencies if necessary).
- If the data shows a problem, then the plan should specify a mechanism to correct the problem.
- Performance-based standards are the way we should go.
- Engineers can design to meet performance-based standards.
- We should consider building into the plan a procedure to review quality control data; a “team” or “group” could look at this subject.

5. Discussion of Contentious Topics

Discuss and answer the following questions to guide the Consultant's work to complete the Water Quality Protection Plan:

1. What is the Standard for Selecting Water Quality Protection Measures?
2. Where are the Measures to be Applied?

The above topics were not discussed in detail at this meeting do to the lack of time. It was agreed that these topics would be discussed at the next SHC meeting scheduled for Wednesday, January 19, 2005.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Proposed January 19, 2005 SHC Meeting.

After the discussion on the future schedule and tasks to be completed, Coordinator Tull proposed the next SHC meeting to be held on Wednesday, January 19, 2005.

2. SHC Report to the Executive/Core Committee.

In accordance with the policy developed by the Process Subcommittee and adopted by the SHC, Coordinator Tull reminded the SHC that the [Government Interest](#) stakeholder group would be responsible for representing the SHC and reporting on the SHC's activities at the next Executive/Core Committee Meeting, currently scheduled for Wednesday, January 12, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:50 pm.

APPROVAL

These minutes were approved, with no changes, at the Stakeholder Committee meeting on _____.