



Meeting Summary
Tuesday, April 20, 2010

Members Present:

Marilyn Christian
Catherine Elliott
Mike Garver
Carol Haddock
Teague Harris
Jason Iken
Tom Ivy

Ron Kelling (phone)
Craig Maske (phone)
Cathy McCoy (phone)
Michael Mooney
Becky Olive
Mitchell Page
Raymond Pavlovich

Linda Pechacek
Ceil Price
Kathy Richolson
Linda Shead
Brian Shmaefsky
Melvin Solomon

Michael Bloom was represented by Jason Maldonado on the phone
John Blount was represented by Alisa Max
Pat Buzbee was represented by Michael Lindsey
Robert Collins was represented by Michael Lindsey
Joe Ferro was represented by Jesse Espinoza
James Tynan Kelly was represented by Bruce Heiberg
Jack Murphy was represented by Susie Blake
Robert Stokes was represented by Lisa Miller-Marshall

Members Absent:

Helen Lane

Jim Robertson

Michael Turco

Guests Present

Mike Bagstad (CH2M Hill), Tom Beck (TxDOT), Linda Broach (TCEQ), Brittany Brownlow on phone (Stormwater Solutions), Ralph Calvino (AECOM), Anju Chalise (TCEQ), Richard Chapin (City of Houston), Winston Denton (TPWD), Bryan Eastham (TCEQ), Frank Green (Montgomery County), Jedediah Greenfield (City of Houston), Eric Hall on phone (KBR), John Harris on phone (City of Friendswood), Nicole Hausler (Port of Houston Auth.), Millie Holifield on phone (City of Missouri City), Anita Hunt (Hunt & Hunt Engineering Corp.), Brian Koch (TSSWCB), Carol LaBreche (City of Houston), Kim Laird (TCEQ), Carol Lamont (Harris County Pct. 3), Ed Matuszak (URS), Yuhayna McCoy on phone (City of Houston, Parks & Rec), Scott McDonald (Harris County), Sarah Metzger (City of Pasadena), Angie Hallimore (R.G. Miller Engineering), Maria Modelska (UH), Chip Morris (TCEQ), Tina Petersen (CDM), Mary Purzer (AECOM), Nick Russo (Harris County PID), Carol Serna (AEI Engineering), Craig Smith (TCEQ), Robert Snoza (HCFCD),

Camille Sowell (CDM), Liz Stone (AECOM), Laurie Thanheiser (on phone), Michael Thornhill (SWWC),

H-GAC Staff Present

Rachel Powers, Erin Livingston, Todd Running, Jeff Taebel, Om Chawla

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 & Members

No alternates or members were proposed.

4. Approval of March 16, 2010, Meeting Summary

Meeting notes were approved with the following changes:

- Cathy McCoy was present on the phone.
- Instead of a narrative summary of the discussion of the table, a reference to the table will be provided.
- The notes shall specify that the draft I-Plan should only contain items for which consensus has been reached.

5. Implementation Plan Report

Staff updated the matrix that was presented at the meeting and copies are available.

Rachel has received several requests for copies of the draft I-Plan. There is no complete draft, only draft sections, and thus she cannot send a complete draft to anyone.

Overview

Rachel presented a one-page draft of a document that might be used to describe the overall BIG picture when we begin our solicitation of formal support. Notable elements of the graphic highlight the cyclical nature of plan evaluation and updates, two types of implementation activities (mandatory/enforcement and voluntary/educational), and a few highlighted implementation activities. The BIG suggested a few changes, which will be incorporated before the document is sent to the BIG for review.

Draft sections sent to workgroups

Rachel reported that ten sections have been sent to the workgroups and that four of those have been sent back to the workgroups with comments incorporated. When the revised draft is sent to the workgroup, two attachments are included in the e-mail: a pdf which contains all of the comments and changes received, and a Word document which incorporates the changes and addresses changes. Three sections have not yet been sent to the workgroups. Once the sections are approved, the nine-elements tables will be developed.

Summary of Substantial Comments

At this time, there are no issues which we anticipate cannot be resolved in the workgroup setting. There were several comments about the numbers of failing OSSFs in the draft, which were derived from the TMDL reports and draft reports. They do seem low, but reflect the TMDL documents.

Maps

Rachel asked that the BIG review the maps that were presented on the wall. This is a comprehensive look at the maps that will probably be included in the I-Plan. These maps will be posted on the website so folks can view and make comments.

Rachel pointed out one map in particular that showed the TMDL project areas relative to the BIG area. The BIG area is larger than the composite of the TMDL project areas, and includes additional watersheds such as Lake Creek and Armand Bayou. The BIG confirmed that it had no objections to the extent of the BIG project area.

Carol Haddock expressed concern about the map showing impervious cover. H-GAC will provide additional information about the data used to generate the map or will consider using a different map to illustrate changes in land surface.

Upcoming Schedule

Rachel reviewed a proposed schedule for the I-Plan. Milestones include having all of the draft sections approved by the workgroups and sent to the BIG for review by the May meeting. The BIG would then be able to consider approving the I-Plan at the June meeting. June approval would allow us to begin soliciting formal support through the summer and go to TCEQ at the end of August.

Once TCEQ receives the draft, it will go through internal review, be considered by the Commissioners prior to public approval, and could be approved by TCEQ as early as January 2011.

The BIG expressed concerns about the ability to resolve issues in the meetings and by e-mails. Rachel will set up a meeting between the May and June meetings to allow time for resolution of any issues.

The BIG also expressed concerns about the one-page overview document, which ought to be scrutinized before it is approved by the BIG. Rachel will send this to the BIG for review.

Q: Is H-GAC going to the elected officials, or will each entity represented do it themselves?

A: H-GAC will manage the process like it did for the public engagement meetings last summer. H-GAC will consult with each of the represented entities regarding how to approach the solicitation for formal support. In addition to BIG members, alternates, participants, and H-GAC's extensive contact network will be consulted.

Load Reduction Values

Rachel presented a draft of estimated load reduction values. The estimated load reductions represent rational, if assumption-laden, values which provide some idea of scale. The document will be sent to the BIG along with more detailed explanations of how the values were identified.

Q: How will these numbers relate to in-stream bacteria levels?

A: These numbers could be applied to each assessment unit, but because there is so much variation throughout the project area, the results would be different in every assessment unit.

Q: Will there be an opportunity to change the estimated loads and reductions as more information comes in?

A: Yes. The plan includes a method for reviewing and updating the plan. TCEQ can also make changes through the state's Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) update, as needed.

Incentives to complete the I-Plan

Rachel reported on several conversations she had with TCEQ and EPA.

TCEQ's TMDL program has received approval to begin tracking implementation activities. They hope to be able to determine successes, and publicly recognize those stakeholders who are successful in their implementation efforts. Both TCEQ and EPA have the ability to withhold 319 grant funds.

The EPA wrote a letter to stakeholders in the Chesapeake Bay area regarding eight measures it could take if adequate progress towards its plan is not met, and these measures could apply to the BIG. The letter is included in the packet.

Hopefully, the opportunity to develop a voluntary program instead of being required to implement a prescribed program is an incentive to undertake voluntary measures.

Of course, our collective desire to have clean water should be a compelling incentive.

6. Other Business/Roundtable

Incorporation of additional segments into the TMDLs

Ron Stein gave a presentation regarding segments that are on TCEQ's 2010 303(d) list which are not currently included in a TMDL plan. The 2010 303(d) list is still in the public comment period and has yet to be finalized by TCEQ or approved by EPA.

TCEQ would like to include these segments in the TMDLs. They plan to do a simple TMDL calculation and incorporate the results into the approved TMDLs through the State's WQMP. The new segments in Lake Houston will be incorporated through the on-going TMDL project for Lake Houston.

Because the BIG has already decided to apply the I-Plan to the watersheds in which the new segments are being added, no changes will need to be made to the I-Plan to influence implementation.

The inclusion of the new segments into the TMDLs will go through a less-involved public comment period, unless the BIG has concerns.

The BIG expressed comfort with the proposal, although they would like to make sure the new Lake Houston segments are given the same consideration as the other Lake Houston segments. Ron confirmed that the BIG would receive notices throughout the process.

Additional Items

Rachel reported that almost 100 people registered for H-GAC's CMOM workshop, and it was well received.

WEAT is offering a Fats, Roots, Oils, and Grease (FROG) workshop on May 13 and 14 at the Hobby Airport Marriott. Flyers were available at the table.

The City of Houston's Water Festival is on May 6, and exhibit space is still available.

Todd Running reported that Trash Bash was a huge success, with over 5500 volunteers, 17 sites, and 91 tons of trash picked up.

7. Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on May 18, 2010.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:45 PM.

4/20/10

Bacteria Implementation Group