



**Draft Meeting Summary
Tuesday, March 15, 2011**

Members Present:

Teague Harris
Tom Ivy
Ron Kelling (on phone)
Craig Maske

Jack Murphy (on phone)
Mitchell G. Page
Linda Pechacek
Ceil Price

Kathy Richolson
Brian Shmaefsky

John Blount was represented by Alisa Max
Marilyn Christian was represented by Snehal Patel
Catherine Elliott was represented by Jonathan Holley
Bruce Heiberg was represented by Steve Hupp
Carol Haddock was represented by Richard Chapin
Jason Iken was represented by Richard Chapin
Michael Mooney was represented by Ron Kelling
Becky Olive was represented by Liz Stone
Raymond Pavlovich was represented by Michael Thornhill

Members Absent:

Michael Bloom
Pat Buzbee
Joe Clark
Robert Collins

Joe Ferro
Mike Garver
Helen Lane
Cathy McCoy

Jim Robertson
Linda Shead
Robert Stokes
Michael Turco

Guests Present

Mike Bagstad (Zarinkelk Engineering), Tom Beck (TxDOT), Russell Cosbey (Huitt-Zollars), Ron Drachenberg (Fort Bend County), Angie Hallimore (R.G. Miller Engineering), Anita Hunt (Hunt & Hunt Engineering Corp.), Joanne Jarreau (Jarreau, Inc.), Brian Koch (TSSWCB), Kim Laird (TCEQ), Patrick Lee (City of Houston), Carole Lamont (Harris County Precinct 3), Scott McDonald (Harris County), Chip Morris (TCEQ), Mary Purzer (AECOM), Marc Reid (Texas Coastal Watershed Program), Scott Saenger (Jones & Carter), Carol Serna (AEI Engineering), Chavonne Slovak (Harris County Precinct 1), Robert Snoza (HCFCD), Guyneth Williams (City of Houston), Maggie Yancey (Greater Houston Builders Association),

H-GAC Staff Present

Todd Running, Rachel Powers, Jeff Murray, Will Merrell, Justin Bower (on phone)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Rachel Powers called the meeting to order at approximately 1:40. Rachel welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. She initiated self-introductions of BIG members, those on the phone, TCEQ, TSSWCB, and H-GAC staff. Rachel then reviewed the agenda.

2. Certification of Quorum

Sixteen members or alternates were present or on the phone, forming a quorum.

3. Approval of Proposed Alternatives and Members

Greg Hall was approved as an alternate for Joe Clark. Jonathan Holley was approved as an alternate for Catherine Elliott.

4. Approval of February 15, 2011, Meeting Summary

Meeting notes were approved with the following correction: Bruce Heiberg was present at the meeting.

5. Public Comment on Draft Implementation Plan Report

No public comment was given.

6. Draft Implementation Plan Public Comment

Rachel began by thanking the members of the ad hoc committee to formulate responses to the public comments: Catherine Elliott, Ceil Price, Marilyn Christian, Steve Hupp, Alisa Max, Mary Purzer, Jonathan Holley, Catarina Cron, and Maria Stone, and additional help from Mitchell Page and Pat Buzbee. Rachel stated that, in general, there was agreement about how to respond and confidence in the responses. Ceil Price echoed that sentiment, explaining that the goal was to create a useful document, there was reasonable give and take, respect for participants with different opinions, and the process was a tribute to the more than two years of effort with the BIG.

Stakeholders presented 206 comments on the plan, many of which were received while the BIG was meeting in February. Most comments were general in nature or addressed the sections on wastewater treatment facilities, storm water and land development, and related appendices. Seventy-three of the comments resulted in recommended changes to the document. Rachel pointed out a few responses to which she had added missing information since the proposed responses were first posted.

The ad hoc committee had recommended that one topic be referred to the BIG for further discussion: comments 135 to 137, which address the topic of smart growth as a research topic. Rachel asked that the BIG address this issue first. Harris County recommended that the reference to smart growth be stricken from the document, various BIG committee members expressed support for the recommendation, and the BIG indicated approval of the change. The BIG also agreed to add the following sentence to the fourth bullet of Research Priority 10.4: Additional Research Topics
“Consideration should be given to evaluating the per-capita contribution of bacteria in relative compact

mixed use developments versus lower density developments.” The responses shall be updated to reflect the conversation.

Q: Where will this document summarizing comments and responses go? In an appendix, administrative record, on a website, or as a paper record? How will people be able to access the document?

A: The BIG decided that it should be included as an appendix in the I-Plan.

The following topics were discussed:

- Comment 29: The exact permit language will be used in the proposed change to the I-Plan.
- Comment 124: This comment probably refers to an ordinance that allows neighborhood associations in the City of Houston to choose to require that parking facilities must be on impervious cover. The response will be updated to refer to the appropriate ordinance.
- Comment 39: The phrase “and operated” shall be removed from the definition of a subscriber system.
- Comment 59: There is a growing concern that, when homeowners are responsible for maintaining their own aerobic OSSF, there is a high probability that the system will be failing. One recent study found a 90% failure rate. Aerobic systems will fail every month if they are not maintained, while conventional systems might only fail a few months each year. A suggestion was made to require that a conventional system be used if the homeowner will be providing maintenance. No changes will be made to the comments or the document, which includes provisions for such considerations by authorized agents.
- Comment 28: In order not to suggest that operators can have complete faith in laboratories, the final sentence of the first paragraph in the response shall be changed to “...and labs *should* be adequately knowledgeable...” Labs that provide data to regulated entities must be certified by NELAC, but operators are still required to be knowledgeable enough to oversee the contracted services, including sample collection.

The BIG indicated with a showing of thumbs up that it approved the responses to the response document with the changes discussed, and including resolution of errors such as typos.

H-GAC will update the response document and make the changes to the I-Plan as specified in the response document. In addition, H-GAC will propose additional changes to the I-Plan—mostly fixes to errata such as typos—to the ad hoc committee for approval. Once those changes have been approved and made to the document, it will be sent to the BIG for formal approval. The goal is to have the updated document to the BIG within two weeks.

7. Approval of Draft for Solicitation of Formal Support

With a showing of thumbs up, the BIG resolved that the draft has been arrived at by consensus and that it is appropriate for the purpose of soliciting formal support in accordance with the guidelines discussed at the February 15, 2011, meeting.

H-GAC will contact BIG members and other stakeholders about how to solicit formal support from their organizations. The goal is to have most of this done by early July so that any concerns can be resolved.

8. Timeline

Once the changes are made, the BIG will have two weeks to review the I-Plan to make sure changes were made in accordance with the response document. As long as there are no objections, the document will be finalized and H-GAC will begin soliciting formal support.

On July 19, 2011, the BIG will meet to review progress on soliciting formal support, resolve any issues that may have arisen, approve the signature page, approve additions pertaining to acknowledgements, public involvement, minority reports, and the appendix that will include formal support resolutions.

On August 16, 2011, the BIG will be asked to approve the document for submittal to TCEQ. The I-Plan will be submitted to TCEQ by August 31, 2011.

Once submitted, the plan will go through review by TCEQ, including a 30-day public comment period. It is possible that the plan will be approved by January 2012.

Q: Will EPA receive a copy?

A: EPA does not have to approve the document, but the document will be available for EPA to provide comments.

9. Other Business/Roundtable

Members of the audience introduced themselves.

H-GAC is hosting a workshop on Landscaping to Prevent Non-Point Source Pollution on March 23, 2011. More information on H-GAC's Clean Waters Initiative webpage:

<http://www.h-gac.com/community/water/cwi/default.aspx>.

On March 15, a draft of the Basin Summary Report will be posted on H-GAC's Clean Rivers Program website: <http://www.h-gac.com/water>. The 686-page document is an in-depth, five-year summary of water quality within the San Jacinto River Basin, the Trinity-San Jacinto Coastal Basin, the San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal Basin, and the Brazos-Colorado Coastal Basin.

H-GAC's Basin Steering Committee is soliciting recommendations pertaining to the ambient monitoring schedule for the next fiscal year.

Trash Bash will be on March 26, 2011. <http://www.trashbash.org/>

11. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be Tuesday, July 19, 2011.

12. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at about 3:00 PM.