



**East and West Fork of the San Jacinto River (E&W) Bacteria  
TMDL:  
ROUND 4 - Public Outreach Report**

**Steering Committee Meeting**

October 1, 2014

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>APPROACH</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>NOTIFICATION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>MATERIALS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>MEETING SYNOPSIS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>NEXT MEETING</b> .....	<b>7</b>



## I. **OVERVIEW**

Per Umbrella Contract 582-14-42709-2, the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) requested Public Outreach support from the Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC) for E&W Bacteria TMDL project, with activities for all elements of Public Outreach including, but not necessarily limited to:

- Identifying and Reserving Facilities for Meetings and / or Events;
- Providing a Facilitator for Any Meetings (As Needed);
- Providing Support for Organizing and Advertising Meetings and / or Events;
- Distribution and Posting of Meeting Agenda(s);
- Preparation of Meeting and / or Event Summaries;
- Preparation of Printed or Other Presentation Materials in Support of a Meeting and / or Event;
- Use of the H-GAC Website for Posting Meeting and / or Event Information; and
- Any Other Necessary Support Activities.

On October 1, 2014 (Round 4), H-GAC conducted a Coordination Committee meeting to discuss the results of E&W Bacteria TMDL work group meetings, consider joining the BIG or developing an I-Plan and next steps.

## II. **PURPOSE**

The water bodies included in this analysis are all within the Lake Houston watershed, which originates in Walker, San Jacinto and Grimes and run through Montgomery, Liberty, and Harris counties.

The Purpose of this meeting was to discuss the following:

1. Review Steps in the TMDL Approval Process
2. Review Work Group Meeting Results
3. Discuss whether to join the BIG or develop an I-Plan
4. Conduct a vote on whether to join the BIG
5. Discuss next steps and consider next meeting date



### III. **APPROACH**

All nominated individuals were contacted directly via e-mail and phone to verify interest in participating on the Coordination Committee; identify best dates / times for the meeting; to notify them of meeting details; and to remind the Committee of the upcoming meeting.

### IV. **NOTIFICATION**

Notification of the meeting took place via phone and/or e-mail. Additionally, TCEQ asked H-GAC to post meeting details to the project webpage (<http://www.h-gac.com/community/water/tmdl/san-jacinto-river-east-west-forks.aspx>).

### V. **MATERIALS**

The following materials were made available for the meeting:

1. Sign-In Sheet(s)
2. Coordination Committee Meeting Agenda
3. Copies of BIG I-Plan

### VI. **MEETING SYNOPSIS**

*Location*

San Jacinto River Authority  
1577 Dam Site Road  
Conroe TX 77304

*When*

Wednesday, October 1, 2014  
10 AM – 12 PM



**Attendees**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED</b>	<b>ASSUMED COUNTY?</b>
Andrew Isbel	Walker County ECU	Walker
Jon Henderson	Walker County ECU	Walker
Brandt Mannchen	Houston Sierra Club	Multiple
Ernest Bailes	Agriculture Producer	Multiple
Brian Koch	TSSWCB	Multiple
Chris Strupp	AEI Engineering	Multiple
Karen Thomas	San Jacinto River Authority	Montgomery
Dale Everitt	San Jacinto County Pct 1 Deputy Cons,	San Jacinto
Damien Carey	Lake Houston Area Nature Club	Harris
David Parkhill	San Jacinto River Authority	Montgomery
Frank Green	Montgomery County	Montgomery
Glenda Callaway	Ekistics Corp. (GBF, BPA)	Multiple
Jennifer Lorenz	Bayou Land Conservancy	Multiple
Shane Simpson	San Jacinto River Authority	Montgomery
Kathaleen S. Ross	Ross Yard Service	Liberty
Hughes Simpson	Texas A&M Forest Service	Multiple
Richard Chapin	City of Houston	Harris
Warren Oja	Sam Houston N. F.	San Jacinto, Walker
Rudy McClellan	Self	Harris
Steve Hupp	BPA	Harris
Davies Mtundu	San Jacinto River Authority	Montgomery
Tom Douglas	Galveston Bay Foundation	Multiple
TW Garrett	City of Plum Grove	Liberty

**To view the sign-in sheet in its entirety, please see Attachment A.**



### *Meeting Outcomes*

- The committee met for approximately two hours.
- The committee listened as the TCEQ reviewed the TMDL approval process.
- The committee reviewed the results of two rounds of work group meetings. Technical work groups met to review available data, discuss the process for developing an implementation plan, reviewed completed implementation plans (I-Plan) and relevant watershed protection plans, consider benefits and concerns for joining the BIG and to make a recommendation to the Coordination Committee to either join the BIG or to develop an I-Plan.
- Technical work groups included:
  - Wastewater Infrastructure
  - Monitoring and Research
  - Natural Resources
  - Enforcement
  - Public Outreach and Education
  - Residential and Commercial Development
- All six technical work groups supported joining the BIG. Reasons given for joining the BIG include:
  - Time Savings
  - Similar Issues
  - Specific concerns can be addressed
  - BIG I-Plan Flexible to address concerns within written strategies
  - Individual organizations implement local measures
  - No mandates, particularly on property owners
  - Work with already established programs
  - East and West Fork part of larger watershed to BIG
  - Offered greater support for receiving grants to correct issues
  - Begin Implementation Now
  - BIG has track record for success
- The workgroups did note that the Coordination Committee should consider recommending that the BIG 1) address a lack of representation from undeveloped areas (e.g. agriculture producers, silviculture, and rural governments), 2) address lack of monitoring data from undeveloped areas, 3) Encourage a broad regional education campaign concerning bacteria and BIG, and 4) Encourage implementation that considers



growth and new developments in addition to restoring impaired areas.

- The Coordination Committee discussed the results of the work groups. The committee agreed with the recommendations made by the work groups and noted that the counties in particular would likely need to be represented with a seat on the BIG. Additionally, the committee would like to see a small to medium sized municipality from a rural community represented. The committee agreed with including an agriculture or silviculture producer on the BIG. The committee also made the recommendation to continue to meet should they vote to join the BIG.
- The committee proceeded to vote on whether to join the BIG or develop an I-Plan. The resulting vote was unanimous to join the BIG.
- The committee reviewed the next steps which will include a meeting to finalize recommendations to present to the BIG.

## VII. **NEXT MEETING**

*Location*

To Be Determined

*When*

To Be Determined