



Meeting Summary
Tuesday, November 16, 2010

Members Present:

Pat Buzbee
Marilyn Christian
Catherine Elliott
Carol Haddock
Teague Harris
Bruce Heiberg
Jason Iken

Tom Ivy
Ron Kelling
Craig Maske
Cathy McCoy (on phone)
Michael Mooney
Becky Olive
Mitchell G. Page (on phone)

Raymond Pavlovich
Linda Pechacek
Ceil Price
Kathy Richolson
Melvin Solomon

John Blount was represented by Alisa Max
Robert Collins was represented by Mike Lindsey
Jack Murphy was represented by Brian Craig (on phone)

Members Absent:

Michael Bloom
Robert Collins
Joe Ferro

Mike Garver
Helen Lane
Jim Robertson

Linda Shead
Robert Stokes
Michael Turco

Guests Present

Steven Archer (Archer Environmental Consulting), Mike Bagstad (Zarenkelk Engineering Services--on phone), Steve Barry (Jones & Carter), Tom Beck (TxDOT), Tony Bennett (AECOM), David Beyer (Storm Water Solutions, LP), Joshua Board (H2O Consulting), Brittany Brownlow (Storm Water Solutions, LP), Bill Carter (TCEQ--on phone), Richard Chapin (City of Houston), Lawrence Childress (City of Houston), Catrina Cron (Harris County), Daya Dayananda (City of Pasadena--on phone), Bryan Eastham (TCEQ), Ricardo Felan (TCEQ), Jedediah Greenfield (City of Houston), Angie Hallimore (R.G. Miller Engineering), Nicole Hausler (Port of Houston Authority), Anita Hunt (Hunt & Hunt Engineering Corp.), Cherie Hyatt (Environmental Allies), Brian Koch (TSSWCB), Carol LaBreche (City of Houston), Carole Lamont (Harris County Precinct 3), Kim Laird (TCEQ), Patrick Lee (City of Houston), Maria Modelska (UH), Scott McDonald (Harris County), Chip Morris (TCEQ), Claudia Notestine (City of Sugar Land), Nwachukwu Sam Okonkwo (TCEQ), Snehal Patel (Harris County--on phone), Tina Peterson (CDM), Mark Reid (TCWP), Donald Richner (City of Houston), Nick Russo (Harris County), Scott Saenger (Jones & Carter), Carol Serna (AEI Engineering), Robert Snoza (HCFCD), Colleen Spencer (City of Sugar Land), Liz Stone (AECOM), Julie Villeneuve (City of Deer Park), Guyneth Williams (City of Houston)

H-GAC Staff Present

Rachel Powers, Erin Livingston, Carl Masterson, Todd Running, Jeff Taebel, Justin Bower, Will Merrell

1. Welcome and Introductions

Rachel Powers called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30. 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 alternatives were present, forming a quorum.

3. Approval of Proposed Alternatives and Members

Frank Green was approved as an alternate for Pat Buzbee.

4. Approval of October 19, 2010 Meeting Summary

Meeting notes were approved.

5. Public Comment on Draft Implementation Plan Report

No public comments were given.

6. Geographic Extent of the BIG Project Area

TCEQ recently released a draft of the Lake Houston Watershed TMDL project for public comment. The maps of the project area shown in the draft TMDL document varied. H-GAC has consulted with TCEQ, and the maps of the BIG project area accurately reflect the correct project area for the Lake Houston watershed TMDL project. If the TMDL project area changes before it is approved, the BIG map will be changed to reflect the updated project boundaries.

Rachel displayed a new map of on-site sewage systems in the region.

7. Draft Implementation Plan Report

Since the last meeting, grammatical and stylistic changes were made to the document and communicated to the BIG. Several changes and questions have been raised regarding more substantial issues, and it is these that the BIG will discuss. The BIG indicated that the draft as it is written is acceptable for the purpose of public comment, but that it would like to review and discuss the proposed changes and questions before formally approving the document.

The following paragraphs describe the decisions that the BIG made for each of the questions and proposals, and some highlights of the discussion. (Information about each of these topics is presented in

meeting handouts: [proposed changes](#) and [questions for discussion](#), both of which are available at <http://www.h-gac.com/BIG>.)

Add language, including bulleted list, to the introduction.

The BIG chose not to add the proposed language.

While the BIG indicated that nutrient and bacteria non-detect limits may have potential, they are not appropriate at this time. In the future, they may be reconsidered, but they do not need to be specified.

Are the activities to address loading from on-site sewage facilities appropriate?

The BIG chose not to change the strategy for OSSF.

BIG OSSF activities are all voluntary. Does the group want to require annual permit renewal fees or repairs upon transfer of property? No, the group did not feel such activities would be appropriate for our region at this time. They would require legislative changes.

Are there too many meetings hosted by H-GAC?

The BIG chose not to change the draft to reduce the number of meetings.

For almost every activity there is at least one meeting. While many of these will be hosted by H-GAC, the document specifies that H-GAC or another appropriate entity may host them and that, when possible, they may be held in conjunction with other meetings and conferences. H-GAC has the resources to coordinate these meetings and will work with other stakeholders to offer such meetings.

Should the plan include an additional implementation activity to require specifications for structural BMPs for stormwater outfalls?

The BIG chose not to add the additional implementation activity.

While the BIG indicated that structural BMPs for stormwater outfalls hold potential, there is not enough evidence that they work to justify the expenditures that would be necessary to modify the outfalls. Structural BMPs should be addressed in other parts of the I-Plan: the research section and the monitoring section.

In Implementation Strategy 4.0, should we add an additional paragraph highlighting the potential effectiveness of stormwater BMPs?

The BIG chose to add the paragraph, pending rewrites.

The paragraph should emphasize the fact that there is limited data about how well structural BMPs might work for reducing bacterial loading. It should also include information about cost consideration.

For Implementation Activity 4.2, move text from 4.2.1 to 4.2, add phrase, and reorder bulleted list.

The BIG chose to make the proposed changes in this section.

Should Implementation Activity 8.1.2 be changed?

The BIG chose not to modify this activity.

If we do not know that residential education works, will anyone do it on a trial basis? It is important to try to figure out whether such activities can work.

Shall we change the sentence “The I-Plan is intended to address a period of about 25 years.”?

The BIG agreed to modify this sentence, pending rewrites.

This sentence should be changed to reflect the adaptive nature of the plan and the fact that it will be changed and updated on a regular basis as we learn more. The sentence must not limit how much time implementation will take, at the same time it communicates the long-term nature of the plan.

Shall the plan include the additional paragraph in the introduction about adaptive management?

The BIG chose to add the proposed paragraph, pending rewrites.

The BIG liked this paragraph, but it would like more consistent language, brevity, and a discussion of cost. We do not want to spend a lot of money until we know it will work.

Shall we add an additional bullet to 9.2.3 regarding targeted monitoring for stormwater BMPs?

The BIG chose not to add an additional bullet but instead to rewrite the existing third bullet, pending rewrites.

The group recognized the importance of targeted monitoring to determine whether structural BMPs on stormwater outfalls work to remove bacteria. However, the group felt that an additional bullet was unnecessary.

Wrap up

Rachel concluded the conversation by confirming that the BIG approved the draft I-plan pending approval of modified language as discussed. The BIG would provide comments by the end of the week by e-mail. H-GAC would modify the language based on the discussion and on comments and send the revisions to the BIG before Thanksgiving. The BIG would then have a week to respond to the proposed revisions.

8. Proposed Public Comment Period

The public comment period would begin once the final edits to the draft are approved and would continue through February 15, 2011. In February, H-GAC will present information about comments received. Based on comments, H-GAC will edit the draft to present to the BIG at the March meeting. In March, the BIG would consider the I-Plan for the purpose of soliciting formal support.

There are three objectives for the public comment period: bring awareness to the project, solicit support, and identify concerns. To bring awareness, H-GAC will host meetings, participate in other

meetings, provide press releases and newsletter articles, host a website, send e-mails, etc. To solicit support and identify concerns, we will offer a web-based survey tool, pass out postcards at meetings we attend, and collect comments in other ways, such as by reviewing reader comments posted on relevant news articles.

Stakeholders are encouraged to contact Rachel if they have opportunities to share information about the BIG. Particular targets of this outreach include communities with which we have had limited contact, such as the Hispanic community and WWTF permit holders.

Rachel is still looking for photos of people recreating in waterways.

9. Timeline

The timeline for the remainder of the I-Plan development process was discussed in conjunction with the public comment.

11. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be Tuesday, February 15, 2011.

One the regular January meeting date—Tuesday, January 18, 2011—H-GAC will host a Clean Waters Initiative workshop on the topic of nutrients. A BIG public comment open house will be held immediately following the workshop.

12. Adjourn

The meeting concluded at about 3:30 PM.