



Meeting Summary
Tuesday, January 19, 2010

Members Present:

Michael Bloom
Pat Buzbee (phone)
Marilyn Christian
Catherine Elliott
Teague Harris
Jason Iken
Tom Ivy
Ron Kelling

Craig Maske
Cathy McCoy (phone)
Michael Mooney
Jack Murphy
Becky Olive
Mitchell Page
Raymond Pavlovich
Linda Pechacek

Ceil Price
Kathy Richolson
Jim Robertson
Brian Shmaefsky
Melvin Solomon
Michael Turco

John Blount was represented by Alisa Max.

Joe Ferro was represented by Jesse Espinoza.

Carol Ellinger Haddock was represented by Sam Metzger.

James Tynan Kelly was represented by Bruce Heiberg.

Robert Stokes was represented by Lisa Miller-Marshall.

Members Absent:

Robert Collins
Mike Garver

Helen Lane
Linda Shead

Guests Present:

Steve Archer (AEC), Mike Bagstad (CH2M Hill), Tom Beck (TxDOT), Tony Bennett (AECOM), Daniel Bowen on phone (Eastex Environmental), Linda Broach (TCEQ), Richard Chapin (City of Houston), Catarina Cron (Harris County), Winston Denton (TPWD-Dickinson), Bryan Eastham (TCEQ), Jedediah Greenfield (City of Houston), Angie Hallimore (RG Miller/Dowdell), Nicole Hausler (PHA), Bob Higgins (AECOM), Margret Himes-Dorman (Citizen), Jonathan Holley (HCFCD), Steven Johnston (GBEP), Brian Koch (TSSWCB), Ken Kramer on phone (Sierra Club), Carol LaBreche (City of Houston), Carole Lamont (Harris County Pct. 3), Ed Matuszak (URS), Maria Modelska (University of Houston), Chip Morris (TCEQ), Mary Purzer on phone (AECOM), Brad Raffle (Conservation Capital), Nick Russo (Harris County), Scott Saenger (Jones & Carter), Carol Serna (AEI Engineering), Robert Snoza (HCFCD), Nancy Sullins (AECOM), Laurie Thanheiser on phone (Environmental Infrastructure Planning), Troy Toland on phone (City of Conroe), Mel

Vargas on phone (Parsons), Guyneth Williams (City of Houston), Jim Wolfe (Severn Trent Services)

H-GAC Staff Present:

Justin Bower, Kristi Corse, Erin Livingston, Carl Masterson, Rachel Powers, Todd Running, Jeff Taebel

1. Welcome & Introductions

Rachel Powers welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. She initiated self-introductions of BIG members, those on the phone, and H-GAC staff. Rachel then reviewed the agenda.

2. Certification of Quorum

Twenty-seven members and alternates were present, achieving a quorum.

3. Approval of Proposed Alternates

Michael Lee and Jeannette Oden were approved as alternates for Michael Turco.

4. Approval of December 15, 2009, Meeting Summary

Meeting notes were approved with the following changes:

- Clarify that the Houston Metro TMDL was not split for public comment as a result of errors, it was split regardless
- Add Michael Turco to the list of members present
- Spell out Capacity, Management, Operations, and Maintenance (CMOM)

5. Workgroup Report

Combined Coordination & Policy and Watershed Outreach

The workgroups met on January 6, 2010, and covered two main topics of discussion: a method for watershed prioritization and a proposal for formal support.

Watershed Prioritization

Some Implementation Activities (IAs) are universal and will be implemented throughout the BIG region. Other IAs are targeted, and it is for these that geographical prioritization is needed.

After exploring various watershed prioritization methods, the group agreed to recommend the use of a set of criteria which communities should consider when deciding where to implement the activities prescribed in the I-Plan. The level of impairment and the perceived level of

contact recreation are the top criteria for a community to consider. Other criteria include structural characteristics of the waterway, aesthetics, and political support. Waterways with the highest bacteria levels and the most use would be priorities, as they present the highest risk.

BIG members generally supported the proposal from the workgroup and agreed that it is appropriate for the I-Plan to provide a framework for considering various factors when prioritizing watersheds for implementation activities. Discomfort was expressed regarding the elevation of the two criteria, impairment and recreation, above the others.

H-GAC staff will draft the watershed prioritization framework for inclusion in the I-Plan and submit it to the workgroup and BIG for comments.

Formal support

Included in the handout was a *Proposal for Formal Support* the workgroups were submitting to the BIG for discussion/approval. Obtaining formal support from the various stakeholder groups for the I-Plan sends a message to TCEQ that there is widespread knowledge of the plan and political support for it. TCEQ staff has indicated that proposed goals seem appropriate. The proposal listed goals concerning the desired percent of various stakeholder groups to profess support for the I-Plan.

Concern was expressed by BIG members that the goal for support from 5% of Utility Districts was too low. The group agreed that the goal should be for support from 10% of Utility Districts.

H-GAC is going to ask all stakeholders for support. If the goals set by the BIG and H-GAC are not met, the I-Plan will still be sent to TCEQ for approval. If a community does not express support for the I-Plan, that community is not excluded from implementing activities included in the I-Plan.

Combined Stormwater and Land Development

The first goal of the meeting was to determine whether the five Stormwater and Land Development Implementation Activities (IAs) selected at the March BIG meeting were appropriate. It quickly became apparent that those present generally did not fully support the IAs. The group decided that an additional meeting was needed. IAs will need to address existing infrastructure in addition to new infrastructure. New IA ideas to be explored at the next workgroup meeting include:

- TCEQ to allow reimbursement for over-excavation and stormwater quality BMPs currently viewed by TCEQ as amenities

- Creation of a certification program to encourage developers to design developments to reduce bacteria loading from development
- Expansion of the MS4 permit areas (there is precedence for this in other portions of the country and is being considered by the EPA in the Chesapeake Bay area)
- Replication of a model program (Phase I MS4 communities may have appropriate activities as models)
- Conservation opportunities

6. Staff Presentation

Rachel gave a brief update on the progress of each section of the I-Plan related to source workgroups. The Wastewater Treatment Facility workgroup section was the furthest along and would be ready for distribution to the workgroup and BIG members by the end of the week. The next workgroup sections will include Construction, Sanitary Sewer Systems, and Onsite Sewage Facilities.

H-GAC is also working on a database that will allow the tracking of implementation activities by assessment unit (AU), including estimated load reductions and costs. Essentially, it will include the nine elements of a Watershed Protection Plan.

7. Other Business/Roundtable

Chip Morris, from TCEQ, provided an update on the Houston Metro and Lake Houston TMDLs. The Greens Bayou TMDL was approved for public comment. A public meeting was scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 2010, at 6:30 PM, at the Lone Star College Greenspoint Center. The four other TMDLs included in the Houston Metro project will go out for public comment next, followed by the Lake Houston TMDL. The plan is to have all adopted by the TCEQ commission by August 31, 2010.

TCEQ commissioners considered the new water quality standards for waterways and new definitions of contact recreation at their last meeting and all was approved for public comment. Rachel will send out a summary with her next email.

8. Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on February 16, 2010.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:48 PM.