

**Meeting Summary**  
**Buffalo & White Oak Bayous Bacteria TMDL Stakeholder Group**

**October 24, 2007**

**STAKEHOLDERS PRESENT:** Latrice Babin; Craig Bourgeois; Catherine Elliott; Robert Hauch; Terry Hershey; Bob Hunt; Tom Ivy; Steve Johnston; Trent Martin; Paul Nelson  
Todd Running; Linda Shead; Mary Ellen Whitworth;

**STAKEHOLDERS ABSENT:** Neil Bishop (represented by Mark Lowery; Del Cannon  
(represented by Cathy McCoy); Claire Caudill; Bill Manning Sr.; Kerry Whelan (resigned);

**SUPPORT TEAM PRESENT:** Carl Masterson (H-GAC); Mary Jane Naquin; Tina Petersen; Hanadi Rifai; Ron Stein (via conference call);

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Jim Coody (Greater Houston Builders Assoc.); Richard Cron (GHBA); Linda Pechacek; Nick Russo (Harris County); Mary Purzer (TCB); Carol Ellinger (City of Houston); Alem Gebriel (TCB); Sharon Crabb (TCB); Bob Adair (Ecosystems); Roger Whitney (City of Houston); Steve Lewis (City of Houston); Susan Mittka (Assoc. General Contractors); Jason Maldonado (PBS&J); Michael Bloom (PBS&J); Sherri Dunlap (HCFCD);

**WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**

**AGENDA REVIEW**

**ADOPTION OF August 30, 2007 MEETING SUMMARY**

There were no suggested changes to the meeting summary and it was adopted by consensus.

**Expectations:**

TCEQ stated that their expectations were to have a fruitful discussion on all the material, and bring all technical areas of the process to a level of clear understanding for everyone.

The majority that was present all want everyone presenter to be able to present the information clearly and also, show the next step into the project and its future.

**Review of Status of TMDL Project since February 8, 2007 Meeting**

Feb 8 meeting discussed the mass balance equation method replacing the previous analysis HSPF model. A mass balance tool was created that is now publicly accessible and available to everyone that solved the copy right issues previously. It was stated that lot of public comments were received during the comment period that was accessible on the web for public review for about a couple of weeks now. The meeting that was held in Aug was a session of the pro's and cons and gave us an opportunity to take the public comments to show an attempt to address the comments and incorporate into changes of the technical report.

## **Results of Stakeholders input on the shift between the TMDL**

Carl stated that an email was sent out to get feedback on who was for or who would prefer to go IQ route, Protection Plan route or Water ship, 7 Implantation, 5 water ship and 1 \_\_\_\_.

## **TCEQ Update**

Everyone was instructed to get a copy of the handout that would be used to discuss the TMDL water ship models. The 2006 list excluded 4 segments and they are as follows that needs to be added:

Bear Creek  
Buffalo Bayou  
Lang Creek  
Mason Creek

It was stated that about 4 years ago the discharge was being monitored and from these areas and the water flow was coming 1014 in exceeding the bacteria allowed according to Bogner Annex water shed standards. The request from the presenter was to get the input of the stakeholders to add and extend the upper water sheds for these 4 areas into the TMDL water sheds loads. In summary adding these 4 new segments into the current TMDL will eliminate having to do a separate TMDL for them plus monitoring is in place to cover the added segments.

## **Regulation Reservoirs Updates**

Regulatory Reservoirs was a concern of the stakeholders and it was stated by the representative that the regulations do not require addressing the reservoirs in any type of order first or last. It was stated that nothing in the regulatory that states it has to be addressed tomorrow or in the primary beginning of the technical report.

## **Revised Mass Balance Tool Analyses**

Documentation was distributed for stakeholders to review and sign up to give comments documentation and the other would be the appendixes and attachments A. A brief recap was given of the all appendixes and instructed on what they would be structured and facilitated. It was suggest to pass around a sheet so that people could sign so that they may receive a cd with the other documentation that was to large to print or email.

A brief summary of the delivery overflow was given, the major comments of the technical areas of the TMDL. The report consisted of multiple data that had been used by the City of Houston, the report itself did not separate the spills, leaks, and overflows, so researchers had do go back into the database to pull and segregate the data. The new data and its models were discussed and the flow of the data was discussed.

### **OSSF update**

Four page of the calculation were distributed to present a brief explanation of the new recalculation of the equations with the new data. The number of septic systems were not published so a representative had to meet with the County to obtain more data provide on a CD to use the Nov 06 calculation. The new calculation were presented in result the OSSF number was much smaller with the new information provided by the county than before with the insufficient data. Also, discussed the chart that showed the different septic systems with the small numbers.

### **Animal Variable updates**

The animal variable update was presented and a complete explanation of the comments from the technical report was reviewed and discussed. All the comments that were sent back in the report were fully explained to the stakeholder and all concerns were addressed and answered. The diotic deposition was confusing to most and it represented the animal flying over the water depositing its bacteria over the water, in which it only coved the length of the bayou and bluff of 10 ft. not the contribution of all the animals.

### **MEMBERHIP ISSUES**

contacted and asked if they would be willing to participate, and if they accept seated at the next meeting. There were no objections to proceeding in this manner. Latrice Babin agreed to contact the microbiologist and the Harris County epidemiologist and Tom Ivey agreed to contact Herb Ward.

Mary Jane Naquin brought up the need for member alternates as the project moves into the implementation planning phase. The group agreed to have Carl Masterson send an email to all members requesting them to identify an alternate to ensure better representation, and thus discussion, at each meeting.

An observation was made that as the project moves into implementation the group should consider those stakeholders who would be involved in implementing and affected by any BMPs implemented.

### **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION**

### **OBSERVER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS**

**NEXT MEETING**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately.