

## **STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - draft**

A meeting of the Stakeholder committee was held as follows:

### **MEETING INFORMATION**

Meeting Date and Time: **October 20, 2004, at 6:00 pm**

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

### **ATTENDEES**

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

**OPTIONAL - Informal Roundtable Discussion on Water Quality Planning Goals and Objectives:**

Prior to the official Stakeholder Committee Meeting an optional, informal Roundtable Discussion on Water Quality Planning Goals and Objectives Within the Planning Region was convened at approximately 5:00 pm. This roundtable discussion was open to all interested stakeholders. The guest speaker was Raymond Slade, a hydrologist formerly with the USGS (retired). Mr. Slade spoke about issues relating to the development of the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan including: existing water quality within the planning region; degradation vs. non-degradation issue; BMP removal efficiencies; pollutant loads vs. concentrations; location of impervious cover within the watershed, including the concept of “effective impervious cover”. The informal roundtable discussion was ended at approximately 6:00 pm.

**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 6:15 p.m. Mr. Tull performed a roll call of members present, as outlined in the table above.

**PLANNED AGENDA - for the October 20, 2004 Stakeholder Committee Meeting:**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
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 September 15, 2004 Stakeholder Committee Meeting – Terry Tull <b>(See attachment 1)</b>
6:15 pm	Review and Discuss the Draft Version of a Standard Operating Procedure for the Outside Technical Review Group - NEI <b>(See attachment 2)</b>
6:35 pm	Review and Discuss the Updated Draft Version of the Goals and Objectives for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan – NEI <b>(See attachment 3)</b>
7:00 pm	Review and Discuss Updated Draft Version of the “Areas of Focus” for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan – NEI <b>(See attachment 4)</b>
7:30 pm	Break
7:45 pm	Review and Discuss the Draft Version of the Water Quality Protection Measures for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan - NEI <b>(See attachment 5)</b>
8:45 pm	Break
8:55 pm	Review and discussion on the Edwards Aquifer Water Quality Advisory Task Force’s Recommendations – overview and discussion of recommendations – NEI <b>(See attachment 6)</b>
9:05 pm	Review and Discuss Updated Project Schedule and Milestones – presentation and discussion of current project schedule - NEI <b>(See attachment 7)</b>
9:15 pm	Discussion on Possible Formats, Methods, and Subject Matters for Technical/ Informational Presentations to the Stakeholder Committee – Terry Tull/NEI
9:25 pm	Other Business (next meeting agenda, etc...)
9:30 pm	Adjourn

### **1. Open Public Comment Period.**

Mr. Ken Manning from the LCRA announced that the LCRA Board of Directors have planned a separate meeting to discuss issues relating to water service in the areas of western Travis County and northern Hays County, including the Hamilton Pool Road water line and the LCRA's current CCN application. Mr. Manning stated that the Board should finalize plans for this meeting in the next few days and that he would notify the SHC members via e-mail.

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

Coordinator Tull reviewed the previously posted copies of the minutes from the August 18, 2004 Stakeholder Committee (SHC) Meeting. The minutes were approved by consensus with minor changes.

### **3. Review and Discussion of the draft Standard Operating Procedures for the outside Technical Review Group (TRG) (Meeting Attachment No. 2).**

Coordinator Tull reviewed the previously posted copy of the Standard Operating Procedure for the outside Technical Review Group. Comments on the document from the SHC included the following:

- the current SOP does not include a presentation(s) by the NEI Consultant Team to the TRG. Something is lost by not having this exchange;
- not allowing graphics in the responses from the TRG is a problem [Tom Brown/NEI stated that the graphics exclusion was included in order to keep the document file sizes down to make the posting to, and retrieving from, the project web site easier. Tom stated that the inclusion of graphics in the TRG responses would be acceptable for now, and that if it became an issue in the future we would address it at that time;
- the categories of technical expertise for the TRG group did not include anything about economic analysis (including sustainable economics and cost/benefit analysis);
- the concept of removing someone from the TRG, as outlined in Item #4 of "Appointment of TRG Members" is not necessary.

Coordinator Tull stated that, based on the input received at this meeting, the NEI Consultant Team would revise the SOP document and present the revised version at the next SHC meeting (November 17, 2004). Coordinator Tull also suggested that, in the interest of saving time, invitations would be sent to those persons nominated to the TRG prior to the next SHC meeting. Those prospective TRG members that accepted the invitation would be considered for approval by the SHC at the November 17, 2004 meeting.

### **4. Review and Discussion of the Updated Draft Version of the "Goals and Objectives for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan" document presented by the NEI Consulting Team (Meeting Attachment No. 3).**

Prior to the discussion of the Updated Draft Version of the "Goals and Objective for the Regional Water Quality Plan" Coordinator Tull stated that it was his opinion that the NEI Consulting Team had done a good job of incorporating the comments and suggestions received from the SHC.

Grant Jackson with NEI introduced this Updated Draft Version of the “Goals and Objectives for the Regional Water Quality Plan” document. Mr. Jackson stated that the most apparent change to the document was the addition of an objective to define water quality (listed as Objective #1), and that the other objectives included in the document had been renumbered, and revised as appropriate.

The SHC discussed the document and the comments are summarized as follows:

**Goal Statement:**

- the use of the term “beneficial use” allows degradation and precludes the establishment of a goal of “non-degradation”;
- the use of the term beneficial use does not preclude the establishment of a goal of “non-degradation”;
- the term “beneficial use” is a regulatory term that has a “regulatory” meaning;
- Get rid of everything after the comma following “...watersheds within the planning region,...”;
- we need clearer goals;
- What about establishing a “Guiding Principle” or “Principle Statement” to protect the environment and preserve land value?;

[At the suggestion of Coordinator Tull, the SHC agreed to meet to discuss the possibility of establishing a set of guiding principles for the planning process. Coordinator Tull requested that one person from each SHC subgroup be nominated for this meeting. Coordinator Tull stated that he would contact the SHC members about this meeting via e-mail.]

**Objective 1:**

- the definition of the term “water quality” should be revised to include stormwater flow
- define “hydrologic regime” as stating that includes water flow
- revise to include the protection of other flora and fauna, not just the Barton Springs Salamander

**Objective 2:**

- no substantial comments received

**Objective 3:**

- revise the objective statement to say that standards should be identified to establish goals & protect existing water quality
- how does this objective fit in with the concept of “non-degradation”?

**Objective 4:**

- no substantial comments received

**Objective 5:**

- revise the third bullet to state “... within the Barton Springs Segment of the Edwards Aquifer and the Barton Creek Watershed, or in the contributing portion of the watersheds within the planning region”;

**Objective 6:**

- allow innovative approaches including compensation of land owners, density trading, etc...
- include as a strategy the “minimization of new sources of pollution” [other SHC members objected to the inclusion of this strategy]

- include a strategy to “minimize negative economic impacts to land owners” [another SHC members suggested adding “and the general public”]

**Objective 7:**

- no substantial comments received

One general comment received was that all edits should be shown on the updated/revised documents to make it easier to see what has been changed.

Grant Jackson stated that the “Goals & Objectives” document would be updated per the comments received and the revised, and hopefully final, version of the document would be presented at the next SHC meeting (November 17, 2004).

**5. Review and Discussion of the Updated Draft Version of the “Areas of Focus” for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan (Meeting Attachment No. 4).**

Grant Jackson reviewed this updated draft version of the “Areas of Focus” document.

The following comments were received from the SHC at the meeting:

**Water Quality Threats**

- Land Development includes construction and post-construction activities, and also includes infrastructure improvements;
- instead of just stating “on-site wastewater treatment” it should include the term “Improper Wastewater Management”;
- Include threats to the hydrologic regime, including water quality;
- include quarrying and mining operations, maybe include under an “Industrial Activities” category;
- the category of “improper land management” should be included under the heading “Watershed Management/Water Quality Protection Measures”.

**Watershed Management/Water Quality Protection Measures**

- include the trading of development rights under “Mitigation for excess impervious cover”;
- include xeriscaping;
- does not address the issue of over-pumping of the aquifer;
- “Alternative water uses/source” should include the concept of wastewater management.

**Economic Implications**

- include “incentives to preserve land”.

Grant Jackson stated that this document would not be presented again, but that the document and the comments would be used to craft the table of contents for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan (a draft of which will be presented to the SHC members for discussion/comment at the next SHC Meeting on November 17, 2004).

## **6. Review and Discussion of the Draft Water Quality Protection Measures for the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan (Meeting Attachment No. 5).**

Grant Jackson referred to the draft Water Quality Protection Measures document that was posted as meeting attachment no. 4 on the planning project's web site. Mr. Jackson stated that the intent of this document was to give the SHC list of the protection measures the Consulting Team is considering for inclusion in the Regional Water Quality Protection Plan. Due to time lack of time this document was not reviewed in detail at the meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **1. Proposed November 17, 2004 SHC Meeting.**

In accordance with the SHC approved schedule, Coordinator Tull proposed the next SHC meeting to be held on Wednesday, November 17, 2004. Mr. Tull stated that a draft agenda would be circulated to SHC members and that the SHC members should review the proposed agenda and provide their comments to him as soon as possible.

### **2. SHC Report to the Executive/Core Committee.**

In accordance with the policy developed by the Process Subcommittee and adopted by consensus by the SHC, Coordinator Tull stated that the Development 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, October 27, 2004 (rescheduled from the originally scheduled October 13, 2004 meeting).

### **3. Meeting of the "Guiding Principles Subcommittee".**

As stated previously in the meeting, Coordinator Tull stated that he would be in touch with all SHC members via e-mail about the scheduling of the time and date for holding the initial meeting of the "Guiding Principles Subcommittee".

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:35 pm.

## **APPROVAL**

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