



**East and West Fork of the San Jacinto River (E&W) Bacteria
TMDL:
Workgroup Report
Natural Resources**

August 25, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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



I. **OVERVIEW**

Per Umbrella Contract 582-12-13254, 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 August 25, 2014 H-GAC facilitated the Natural Resources Workgroup meeting to review and discuss implementation plans, consider joining the BIG and discuss 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 workgroup meeting was to discuss the following:

1. Discuss the Process for Developing an I-Plan
2. Review Two Examples of I-Plans and One Watershed Protection Plan Specific for Subject Area
3. Discuss the Benefits and Challenges for Either Joining the BIG or Developing an I-Plan, and
4. Vote to Join the BIG or Develop an I-Plan
5. Discuss Next Steps.



III. **APPROACH**

Stakeholders who attended the previous work group meeting or showed interest in the work group were invited to participate in a Doodle Poll sent via email to identify the best date/time for the next meeting. Once the date and time were selected, the work group was notified via email to provide them with the meeting details. A second email was sent to remind the potential attendees of the upcoming meeting.

IV. **NOTIFICATION**

Notification of the workgroup meeting took place via phone and e-mail. Additionally, H-GAC posted the 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. Natural Resources Meeting Agenda
3. Natural Resources Meeting Summary (July 8, 2014)
4. Sections of the BIG I-Plan, Dickinson Bayou I-Plan, and Plum Creek Watershed Protection Plan related to topic area.

VI. **MEETING SYNOPSIS**

Location

Cleveland Civic Center
210 Peach Avenue
Cleveland, TX 77327

When

Monday, August 25, 2014
10 AM – 12 PM



Attendees

NAME	ORGANIZATION REPRESENTED	ASSUMED COUNTY?
Brian Koch	TSSWCB	
Jody Cronin	Shepherd ISD	
Brandt Mannchen	Houston Sierra Club	
Ernest Bailes	Self	San Jacinto
Rodger Randall	TAA	

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

Meeting Outcomes:

- Group reviewed sample TMDL I-Plans and Watershed Protection Plans. Group discussed the need to get a clear picture for what the area looks like regarding bacteria levels in rural and undeveloped watersheds. Group was concerned that agricultural and undeveloped land interests were under represented in the BIG and that representation would be needed from the watershed, particularly the East Fork. Group wants to ensure that funding and other resources would be targeted to the watershed so that the area was not ignored.
- Group discussed whether to join the BIG or to create a standalone I-Plan. The group would like to see a representative come from the East Fork, monitoring resources be committed to gather additional data from undeveloped and rural lands and that the Coordination Committee continue to meet to ensure that rural and local watershed issues continue to be discussed.
- A majority of the group recommend that the Coordination Committee vote to join the BIG. One member decided that the watershed was too different from the BIG that developing an independent I-Plan would be more valuable.

VII. NEXT MEETING

To Be Determined