

**Bacteria Implementation Group
Meeting Summary**

July 8, 2008

Members Present:

Michael Bloom	Jason Iken	Becky Olive
John Blount	Tom Ivy	Raymond Pavlovich
Pat Buzbee	Ron Kelling	Linda Pechacek
Robert W. Collins	James Tynan Kelly	Ceil Price
Carol Ellinger	Helen Lane	Kathy Richolson
Catherine Elliott	Craig Maske	Jim Robertson
Joe Ferro	Jim Meley	Linda Shead
Mike Garver	Michael Mooney	Melvin Solomon
Teague Harris	Jack Murphy	

Marilyn Christian (represented by Snehal Patel)
Mitchell Page (represented by Michael Page)
Bob Stokes (represented by Vanessa Mintzer)

Members Absent:

Brian Shmaefsky

Guests Present:

Linda Broach (TCEQ), Carole Lamont (Harris County Precinct 3), Alisa Max (Harris County Watershed Protection Group), Philip Moore (Montgomery County Environmental Health), Richard D. Smith (Cypress Creek Flood Control Coalition), Charlie Adams (TCEQ), Steve Barry (Jones & Carter), Jennifer Davis, Chris Defrancis (City of Nassau Bay), Winston Denton (TX Parks and Wildlife Department), Dixon D. Dryden (Environmental Construction Soc), Pat Duncan (Montgomery County Environmental Health), Casey Johnson (TCEQ), Steven Johnston (Galveston Bay Estuary Program), Brian Koch (Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board), Gordon Landwermeyer (Westador MUD), Gail Miller (Harris County Precinct 2), Maria Modelska, Scott Nichols (Montgomery Co Health), Anne Olson (Buffalo Bayou Partnership), Tina Petersen (CDM), Nic Ramirez (AEI Engineer), Hanadi Rifai (University of Houston), Scott Saenger (Jones & Carter), Frank Salzhandler (Endangered Species Media Project), David C. Schanbacher (TCEQ), Ron Stein (TCEQ), Laurie Debrie Thanheiser, Terri Thomas (Bayou Preservation Association), Michael Thornhill (SWWC), Ashley Warnix (SWEL), Tom Weber (TCEQ)

H-GAC Staff Present:

Jeff Taebel, Om Chawla, Kristina Hardwick, Carl Masterson, Rachel Powers, Bruce Ridpath, Todd Running

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Jeff Taebel welcomed the attendees, briefly discussing the significance and magnitude of the project the BIG is undertaking. He continued by discussing the formation of the group, its independence, and H-GAC's role as a support agency. He then initiated self introductions of H-GAC staff and BIG members.

2. PURPOSE OF BIG

TCEQ Perspective: After being introduced by Carl Masterson, Tom Weber expressed his gratitude to the members of the BIG and the other attendees for making the commitment to this project. Tom introduced Ron Stein and Casey Johnson from the TMDL program and Steve Johnston from GBEP, and explained the TCEQ's role providing assistance and technical support. Tom sees the group as a representative forum, with members representing a broad group of stakeholders. He expects that the group members will reach out to and interact widely with stakeholders outside of the BIG to develop support for the plan.

Scope of Implementation Plans: Given the wide range of knowledge levels within the BIG, Jeff Taebel thought that perhaps the best place to begin was with a discussion of implementation plans. Jeff introduced Rachel Powers to discuss generalizations about implementation plans. Rachel discussed the document included in the handout packet entitled "Implementation Plan Review." The documents reviewed were I-plans for bacterial TMDLs. Many plans, most not included in the review, were from agricultural areas in the west and did not include urban considerations. Others were constructed under legal pressure and were less comprehensive than the document the BIG might wish to develop.

Michael Bloom commented that most implementation plans are included within TMDL documents, and it might be instructive to provide further information in the next meeting. He suggested that in particular the bacterial TMDL for the Columbia Slough in Portland, Oregon, might be of interest.

John Blount pointed out that Harris County Commissioners Court approved Harris County's bacteria implementation plan at 10:30 that morning. John agreed to provide a copy of that document for distribution.

Timeline: Rachel briefly discussed a timeline for development of the TMDL project. She estimates that development of the document will probably take a minimum of two years, largely based on the estimated completion schedule for the four TMDL projects and on development schedules for similar projects. Two of the TMDLs, for Clear Creek and for Buffalo and Whiteoak, just finished the public comment period on July 5. The other two TMDL projects, for Lake Houston and the Houston Metro area, should be drafted and prepared for approval in late 2009.

Carl pointed out that two years may be too ambitious, and it might take more time to do a thorough job.

Carl took this opportunity to introduce David Schanbacher, the Chief Engineer for TCEQ. David has attended some of the stakeholder meetings. Carl pointed out the value of having TCEQ's upper-level management involved in the process and having a bird's-eye view of the project.

The question was asked whether anything precludes this group from developing a skeletal structure for an appropriate implementation plan before the TMDLs are completed. Carl responded that there does not appear to be anything that would prohibit the group from proceeding.

Carol Ellinger asked whether workgroups would be limited to BIG members. Carl said that the expectation was that the workgroups would be open, although it would be up to the BIG. Rachel used this question to segue into the discussion of the organizational considerations.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Rachel mentioned that the question about workgroup membership was one of many questions that she had received from interested parties regarding the organization and structure of the BIG, and she expected that there have been additional conversations among the interested parties. H-GAC staff prepared a draft of possible ground rules for the group, to be used to guide discussion.

Michael Bloom asked whether there would be multiple implementation plans to address multiple stream segments or whether there would be a shell to encompass all of the TMDLs. Tom Weber answered that it could be either way, provided there was enough customization.

Replacements and Additions: After giving the group—including the audience—a few minutes to review the draft, she asked that the group start with the section on Replacements and Additions on page 2. Rachel explained that the approved representative from the City of Conroe was no longer available to be a representative of municipal interests, but that the City of Conroe had sent Melvin Solomon, the wastewater plant and industrial pre-treatment supervisor, as a possible replacement. Nobody had any objections to accepting the Replacements and Additions section. Melvin's appointment to the committee was approved by all.

Alternates: Rachel then asked that, based on the frequency of questions on this topic, the group consider the section on Alternates on page 3. She pointed out that, invariably, members will be unable to attend all meetings, and in these situations alternates can provide valuable in-pu and report back to the representative. On the other hand, the committee members have committed to the BIG, and the argument could be made that,

given the gravity and import of the topic, members should be at enough meetings so that an alternate is unnecessary.

Carole Ellinger expressed her support for having alternates, despite the merits of the argument against alternates. She respectfully asked that members have a designated alternate or someone that is able to attend meetings regularly and who would be up-to-speed, and able to step in at any time, and speak on the members' behalves.

Ceil Price asked that any meeting materials be distributed to designated alternates, provided the representative designate that alternate in advance.

A discussion then ensued regarding:

- Whether a regular, designated alternate can help determine a quorum
- Whether an irregular alternate can help determine a quorum
- Whether a regular, designated alternate can vote on important issues
- Whether an irregular alternate can vote on important issues
- Whether organizational representatives are interchangeable or whether individual representatives are not universally replaceable
- How many designated alternates are appropriate
- Whether proxies are legal

There was general agreement that H-GAC staff should modify the section on alternates to reflect the following:

- BIG members may nominate up to two designated, regular representatives that the BIG would approve.
- It is a goal but not a requirement that members and alternates should attend all meetings.
- A member should give notice by e-mail or writing by the end of the business day prior to a meeting that an 'undesignated' alternate will be representing him or her.

Rachel will modify the Ground Rules to reflect this discussion.

Goals: Rachel asked for comments on the goals section.

Discussion ensued regarding various elements of the draft goals, with the following points being talked about:

- The goal should be to decrease the bacteria to meet the designated use as opposed to today's water quality standard
- How the goals & I-plan would change if the TMDLs, the designated uses, or the standards were to change
- Whether "execute" was an appropriate word or if "recommend" would be better
- The word "develop" should be expanded to suggest or clarify that this is a set of recommendations that goes to the TCEQ for adoption

- Whether the I-Plan would be binding on local entities in the area after it is adopted by the TCEQ as part of the state's Water Quality Plan
- Whether the contact recreation standard is the most stringent
- Whether we are seeking to attain the standard or if we must try to meet the standard

A suggestion was made to change "...develop and execute an I-plan to decrease the bacteria loading ..." to "...develop and recommend to TCEQ an I-Plan to decrease the bacteria loading in the bacteria-impaired waterways of the Houston-Galveston Region for which TMDLs are being done or have been completed to meet the water quality standards and make them suitable for their current designated use."

Powers: Rachel referred to previous discussion in which it was proposed that the BIG's powers are to recommend to TCEQ an implementation plan. Michael Bloom suggested that the second sentence was unnecessary. Rachel said she would modify and shorten this section pursuant to the conversation.

Time Frame: Rachel briefly restated the goal of trying to complete the I-plan within two years, by June 2010. Carole Ellinger asked whether that would meet EPA requirements that a TMDL be completed within 13 years of being listed as impaired. TCEQ clarified that the requirement only pertained to TMDL adoption, and not the implementation plan.

Snehal Patel emphasized the need to work backwards from the target date to see whether there is adequate time within to complete all the tasks necessary for completion. A discussion ensued regarding whether the two-year timeframe would include getting approval from stakeholders such as commissioners courts and city councils. Hopefully, the two-year timeframe will include getting approvals, but this may be ambitious.

John Blount asked about the BIG's responsibility in terms of getting approval from governing bodies. Jeff Taebel hypothesized that TCEQ would probably be more interested in approving a plan that has approval from multiple governing bodies instead of a plan with limited approval from governing bodies. There was some discussion of how much authority was granted to BIG members by elected officials that nominated potential BIG members. The signatures on the I-plan represent a consensus that these are the recommendations that should be included in the I-plan that goes to TCEQ. The signatures might be necessary in order to get buy-in from government agencies, who will be asked to adopt the recommendations before the plan is submitted to TCEQ. The comment was made that the recommendations in the I-plan will be like any other staff recommendation that we make to our employers or to the entities we represent—they may either act on the recommendation or reject it at their discretion.

Tom Weber stated that he thought the signatures of the BIG, even without the endorsement of county commissioners courts and city councils, would be a strong

endorsement. There are no guidelines or rules in this regard. Endorsement by county commissioners courts and city councils would not be necessary. Resolutions—for or against the recommendations—could be made during the formal public comment period.

Referencing the ***Roles and Responsibilities*** section, a recommendation was made to indicate that BIG members will be asked to sign the “recommended I-plan” instead of the “final I-plan.” Later in the meeting, it was agreed that a clarification would be made in the I-plan regarding the significance of the signatures.

Quorum: Ron Kelling asked whether a quorum is 51% of members present or 51% of members. The group recommended that a quorum be 51% of members, not members present. A recommendation was made to specify that a quorum was not necessary to hold a meeting or have discussions, but that a quorum was necessary for making substantial decisions.

Decision-making Process: A question was raised regarding the difference between a simple majority vote and a two-thirds majority vote. Discussion ensued regarding the following:

- At what point would consensus be abandoned, if at all, for a majority vote?
- Would decisions be made by members present or by all members? If all present, it would encourage attendance, although it might limit the total number of people making the decision.
- What types of decisions need to be made by what type of decision making?
- How long it will take to achieve consensus?
- Different types of consensus (consensus -1, consensus -2)

In the second sentence of the section, “agree” will be changed to “accept.”

Major decisions will be made by consensus of those present, when possible. If that is not possible, a 2/3 majority vote of those present will be made with the stipulation that a minority report may be included in the I-plan.

Meetings: H-GAC recommended monthly meetings on the third Tuesday of each month at 1:30 in the afternoon, except in October, when the Bayou Preservation Association is hosting a symposium. H-GAC will check room availability on the fourth Tuesday of October.

Workgroups: A recommendation was made to modify the workgroups section to not include a list of workgroups, initially.

Officers: H-GAC staff recommended the nomination of a chair and co-chair, with a vote at the next meeting. Snehal Patel suggested that a chair and co-chair are not necessary, and the group agreed that officers were not necessary.

4. ORGANIZATION OF WORKGROUPS

John Blount presented a list of possible workgroups based on the County's work developing an implementation plan to address bacteria. This list is based on the "Kansas Plan," and is as follows:

1. Watershed Prioritization & Classification
2. Wastewater Treatment Plants (regionalization, design & operations)
3. Research (background bacteria levels, regrowth, instream dynamics)
4. Monitoring Program
5. Stormwater (development, illicit discharges, fertilizers, agriculture/horticulture, public education, household hazardous waste programs)
6. Sanitary Sewer Overflows (fats, oils, & greases, aging systems, illicit connections)
7. Onsite Sewage Facilities
8. Wildlife and Other Animals

Discussion ensued regarding the overlap between the original list of possible workgroups and the County's list. Source water was suggested as another area not included in either list. Rachel agreed to draft a combination of the two lists with the additional suggestions for consideration by the BIG.

A question was asked regarding the publication of the Clear Creek and the Buffalo and Whiteoak TMDL projects. Both are published on the H-GAC and TCEQ websites.

5. Meeting Schedule

Regular meetings will be on the third Tuesday of each month at 1:30 in the afternoon.

6. Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be on August 19, 2008.

The BIG was asked if there was interest in an informational/education session regarding TMDLs in general and information about each of the four TMDL projects. Based on interest, H-GAC will host such a meeting on July 22, 2008, from 1:30 to 3:30 at H-GAC offices.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 PM.

Bacteria Implementation Group Ground Rules

The following are Ground Rules for the Bacteria Implementation Group (hereafter referred to as the BIG) agreed to and signed by the members of the BIG in an effort to develop and execute an Implementation Plan (I-Plan).

The signatories to these Ground Rules agree as follows:

GOALS

The goal of the BIG is to develop and recommend to the TCEQ an I-Plan to decrease the bacteria loading in the bacteria-impaired waterways of the Houston-Galveston region, for which TMDLs are being done or have been completed, to meet water quality standards and make the waterways suitable for their current, designated use.

POWERS

The BIG is the decision making body for the I-Plan. The BIG's powers are to recommend an I-Plan to the TCEQ for consideration. As such, the BIG will formulate recommendations to be used in drafting the I-Plan and will guide the implementation of the I-Plan to success. Formal BIG recommendations will be identified as such in the planning documents and meeting summaries.

Although formation of the BIG was facilitated by the Natural Resource Advisory Committee and the Houston-Galveston Area Council, the BIG is an independent group of watershed stakeholders and individuals with an interest in restoring bacteria levels to a level safe for contact recreation.

The BIG provides the method for public participation in the planning process and will be instrumental in obtaining local support for actions aimed at restoring surface water quality in the region.

TIME FRAME

Development of an I-Plan will require at least a twenty-four month period. The target date to complete the initial development of the I-Plan is June 2010. The BIG will function throughout the twenty-four month initial development period and may continue to function thereafter as a recommendation of the I-Plan or BIG.

BIG MEMBERSHIP SELECTION

The BIG is composed of stakeholders from the Houston-Galveston region. Initial solicitation of members for equitable geographic and topical representation was conducted through a call to all stakeholders for nominations.

Stakeholders are defined as either those who make and implement decisions, those who are affected by the decisions made, or those who have the ability to assist with implementation of the decisions.

MEMBERSHIP

Members include both individuals and representatives of organizations and agencies. A variety of members serve on the BIG to reflect the diversity of interests within the region and to incorporate the viewpoints of those who will be affected by the I-Plan. To effectively function as a decision-making body, the membership shall achieve geographic and topical representation. If the BIG feels a constituent group is not represented fully or at all they will have the ability to add members.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

BIG members are expected to participate fully in group deliberations. Members will identify and present insights, suggestions, and concerns from a variety of perspectives. BIG members are expected to work constructively and collaboratively with other members toward reaching consensus.

BIG members will be expected to assist with the following:

- Create and oversee workgroups;
- Analyze and summarize data;
- Determine applicable BMPs;
- Prioritize BMPs to achieve goals;
- Help to develop an I-Plan document and timetable for implementation;
- Help to lead the effort in implementing this plan at the local level;
- Assist in developing a monitoring plan; and
- Communicate implications of the I-Plan to other stakeholders in the watershed and obtain commitments from stakeholders.

BIG members may submit recommendations as individuals or on behalf of their affiliated organization(s).

BIG members will be asked to sign the recommended I-Plan. The I-Plan will contain information regarding the significance of the signatures, including references to any objections and information about authority.

H-GAC will serve as the facilitator for meetings of the BIG.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the BIG has discretion to form standing and ad hoc workgroups to carry out specific assignments from the Group. BIG members may serve on one or more workgroups and represent that workgroup at BIG meetings to bring forth information and recommendations.

WORKGROUPS

Topical workgroups formed by the BIG will carry out specific assignments from the Group.

Each workgroup will be composed of a minimum of at least one BIG member and additional individuals with a vested interest in that topic. There is no limit to the number of members on a workgroup. Each workgroup will elect a chair.

Tasks such as research or plan drafting will be better performed by these topical workgroups. Workgroup members will discuss specific issues and assist in developing that portion of the I-Plan; however, BIG members will have the final approval.

REPLACEMENTS AND ADDITIONS

The BIG may add new members if (1) a member is unable to continue serving and a vacancy is created or (2) important stakeholder interests are identified that are not represented by the existing membership. A new member must be approved by a majority of existing members. In either event, the BIG will, when practical, accept additional members.

ALTERNATES

Members may designate up to two alternate representatives in the event that the member is unable to attend a meeting. These alternates will be compiled in a list that is submitted to the BIG for approval. Modifications to the list of alternates will be submitted to the BIG for approval on an as-needed basis.

An irregular, undesignated alternate may be designated by a member, provided the member notifies the H-GAC facilitator by e-mail or in writing prior to the close of the business day prior to a meeting.

An alternate will be able to vote and speak on behalf of the member, will receive the same notifications that are sent to the member, and is encouraged to attend all meetings. An alternate who is neither attending with advance notification nor on the approved list of alternates will not be able to participate in votes.

Absentees may also provide input via another Committee member or send input via the facilitator. The facilitator will present such information to the Committee, but will argue neither for nor against the viewpoint on that person's behalf.

ABSENCES

All BIG members agree to make a good faith effort to attend all meetings; however, the members recognize that situations may arise necessitating the absence of a member. Three absences in a row of which the facilitator was not informed of beforehand or without designation of an alternate constitute a resignation from the BIG.

DECISIONMAKING PROCESS

The BIG will strive for consensus when making decisions and recommendations. Consensus is defined as a decision which all stakeholders are willing to accept. Consensus inherently requires compromise and negotiation, and should be inclusive, participatory, cooperative, egalitarian, and solution oriented.

If consensus cannot be achieved, the BIG will make decisions by a simple majority vote. If members develop formal recommendations, they will do so by two-thirds majority vote of those present, with the stipulation that minority reports may be included in the I-Plan.

QUORUM

In order to conduct business, the BIG will have a quorum. Quorum is defined as at least 51% of the members. Designated alternates attending on behalf of members will count towards the quorum. A quorum is not necessary to hold a meeting or have discussions.

MEETINGS

All meetings (BIG meetings and Workgroups) are open and all interested stakeholders are encouraged and welcomed to participate.

Over the twenty-four month development period, regular meetings of the BIG will occur each month. The BIG may determine the need for additional meetings. Meetings will be scheduled to accomplish specific milestones in the planning process. Workgroups will set their own meeting schedule to coordinate with BIG meetings, tasks, and milestones.

Meetings will start and end on time. Meeting times will be set in an effort to accommodate the attendance of all members.

AGENDA

H-GAC staff, in consultation with BIG members, is charged with developing the agenda. The anticipated topics are determined at the previous meeting and through correspondence. A draft agenda will be sent to the group with the notice of the meeting. Agendas will be posted on the project website. Agenda items may be added by members at the time that the draft agenda is provided. H-GAC staff will review the agenda at the start of each meeting and the agenda will be amended if

needed and the members agree. The Group will then follow the approved agenda unless they agree to revise it.

MEETING SUMMARIES

H-GAC staff will draft meeting summaries based on meeting notes and/or audio recordings. H-GAC staff will distribute meeting summaries to the committee for their review and approval. All meeting summaries will be posted on the project website.

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

H-GAC staff will prepare and distribute the agenda and other needed items to members. Distribution will occur via email and websites, unless expressly asked to use U.S. Mail (i.e. member has no email access). To encourage equal sharing of information, materials will be made available to all. Those who wish to distribute materials to the BIG or a Work Group may ask H-GAC staff to do so on their behalf.

INFORMATION

All members agree to openly exchange relevant information that is readily available to them. If a member believes he or she cannot or should not release relevant information, the member will provide the substance of the information in some form (such as aggregating data, deleting non-relevant confidential information, providing summaries, or furnishing information to the facilitator for limited or restricted use or to abstract) or a general description of it and the reason for not providing it directly.

Members will provide information as much in advance of the meeting at which it is to be discussed as is reasonably possible.

Information and data provided to the BIG are a matter of public record.

The BIG does not have authority to protect confidential business information (CBI). When information required for BIG deliberations can only be derived from CBI (i.e. innovative technology, cost, or pricing information), the information may only be received by the BIG in aggregate form so as to protect specific CBI from release.

No member is expected to share advance information on its plans or strategy for filing or defending against litigation over TMDL issues. No member is expected to share any information that is subject to attorney/client privilege.

SPEAKING IN THE NAME OF THE COMMITTEE

Individuals do not speak for the BIG as a whole unless authorized by the Group to do so. Members do not speak for H-GAC and H-GAC does not speak for BIG members. If BIG spokespersons are needed, they will be selected by the Group.

Additionally, Workgroups and individual Workgroup members are not authorized to speak for the BIG.

DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION OF GROUND RULES

These ground rules were drafted by the H-GAC and presented to the BIG for their review, possible revision, and adoption. Once adopted, ground rules may be changed by consensus provided a quorum is present.

We, the undersigned, as members of the BIG, agree to these Ground Rules of the Bacteria Implementation Group.

Michael Bloom

John Blount

Pat Buzbee

Marilyn Christian

Robert Collins

Carol Ellinger

Catherine Elliot

Joe Ferro

Mike Garver

Teague Harris

Jason Iken

Tom Ivy

Ron Kelling

James Tynan Kelly

Helen Lane

Craig T. Maske

Jim Meley

Michael Mooney

Jack Murphy

Becky Olive

Mitchell G. Page

Raymond Pavlovich

Linda Pechacek

Ceil Price

Kathy Richolson

Jim Robertson

Linda Shead

Brian Shmaefsky

Melvin Solomon

Bob Stokes

BACTERIA IMLEMENTATION GROUP

Roster with Alternates

Name	Representing	Affiliation	Alternate 1	Alternate 2
Michael Bloom	Ag/Business	PBS&J, Greater Houston Partnership		
John Blount	County	Harris County Planning & Operations Division	Alisa Max	
Pat Buzbee	County	Montgomery County Environmental Health		
Marilyn Christian	County	Harris County Public Health & Environmental Svcs.	Snehal Patel	
Robert W. Collins	County	Montgomery County		
Carol Ellinger	Municipal	City of Houston	Sarah Metzger	Richard Chapin
Catherine Elliott	County	Harris County Flood Control District	Joe Myers	Carolyn White
Joe Ferro	Municipal	City of Webster		
Mike Garver	Buffalo/Whiteoak TMDL	Buffalo Bayou Partnership	Scott Barnes	
Teague Harris	Municipal	Pate Engineers, Inc.		
Jason Iken	Metro TMDL	City of Houston		
Tom Ivy	Public	Texas Stream Team		
Ron Kelling	Ag/Business	San Jacinto River Authority		
James Tynan Kelly	Conservation	Bayou Preservation Association	Bruce Heiberg	
Helen Lane	Conservation	Houston Audubon		
Craig Maske	Metro TMDL	Dodson & Associates, Inc./HCEC		
Jim Meley	Ag/Business	Harris County Soil & Water Conservation Dist. #442	Cathy McCoy	
Michael Mooney	Lake Houston TMDL	The Woodlands Joint Powers Agency		
Jack Murphy	Municipal	City of League City		
Becky Olive	Ag/Business	TCB	Nancy Sullins	Tony Bennett
Mitchell G. Page	Lake Houston TMDL	Schwartz, Page & Harding, LLP	Michael Page	
Raymond Pavlovich	Wildcard	Nottingham Country Municipal Utility District	Michael Thornhill	Mark Stendahl
Linda Pechacek	Public	Citizen, Civil Engineer		
Ceil Price	Buffalo/Whiteoak TMDL	City of Houston	Michael Schaffer	Guyneth Williams
Kathy Richolson	Clear Creek TMDL	Gulf Coast Waste Disposal Authority		
Jim Robertson	Conservation	Cypress Creek Flood Control Coalition	Richard "Dick" Smith	
Linda Shead	Conservation	Trust for Public Land	Mary Ellen Whitworth	
Brian Shmaefsky	Public	Lonestar College, Kingwood		
Melvin Solomon	Municipal	City of Conroe		
Robert Stokes	Clear Creek TMDL	Galveston Bay Foundation	Vanessa Mintzer	

Bacteria Implementation Group Work Group List

Source Workgroups
Agriculture, horticulture, silviculture, fertilizer, and mulch
Animals: pets, wildlife, livestock
Construction/development
Illicit discharges & dumping: identification & enforcement
On-Site Sewage Facilities (OSSF): design, installation, and maintenance
Sanitary Sewer Overflows: aging systems; illicit connections; and fats, oils, & greases
Stormwater: structural and non-structural controls
Waste Water Treatment Facilities (WWTF): Design, operation, and regionalization of WWTFs and collection systems

Additional Workgroups
Outreach & Education: internet coordination, identifying and involving new stakeholders
Legal, regulatory, policy, and finance
Monitoring: coordination of monitoring agencies, future monitoring plans
Research: background bacteria levels, regrowth, and resuspension; in-stream dynamics; Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) and feasibility; Standards; Aquatic habitat; BMPs
Watersheds: segment prioritization and classification; coordination with outreach workgroup
Clear Creek
Buffalo/Whiteoak
Houston Metro
Lake Houston

Upcoming TMDL Dates of Interest

August 28, 2008

1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Houston Ship Channel Dioxin/PCB Stakeholder Group

H-GAC Offices, Conference Room B

3555 Timmons Lane, Suite 120

Houston, TX 77027

September 10, 2008

Clear Creek TMDL: Bacteria – this TMDL will be up for approval at the TCEQ Commissioners' meeting

TCEQ

12100 Park 35 Circle

Room 201S, Building E

Austin, TX 78753

September 16, 2008

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Bacteria Implementation Group Meeting

H-GAC Offices, Conference Room B

3555 Timmons Lane, Suite 120

Houston, TX 77027

September 24, 2008

Buffalo/Whiteoak Bayou TMDL: Bacteria – this TMDL will be up for approval at the TCEQ Commissioners' meeting

TCEQ

12100 Park 35 Circle

Room 201S, Building E

Austin, TX 78753

October 6, 2008

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Houston Metro TMDL Public Meeting: Greens Bayou
Lone Star College: Greenspoint Center (Room 306)
250 N. Sam Houston Parkway East
Houston, TX 77060

October 7, 2008

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Houston Metro TMDL Public Meeting: Sims Bayou
Sunnyside Multi-Service Center
4605 Wilmington St
Houston, TX 77051

October 8, 2008

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Houston Metro TMDL Public Meeting: Eastern Houston
Third Ward Multi-Service Center
3611 Ennis
Houston, TX 77004

October 13, 2008

6:00 PM – 8:00 PM

Houston Metro TMDL Public Meeting: Halls Bayou
Aldine Y.O.U.T.H.
4700 Aldine Mail Route
Houston, TX 77039

October 14, 2008

5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Houston Metro TMDL Public Meeting: Brays Bayou
Bayland Community Center
6400 Bissonnet Street
Houston, TX 77074