



**Coordination & Policy Workgroup
Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, March 25, 2014
10:00 PM to 12:00 PM
H-GAC Conference Room C, Second Floor**

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions

Review Notes from 12/16/2013 Meeting

Discussion: BIG's Ground Rules

Workgroup will review the BIG's ground rules to determine if any changes are warranted. If changes are needed, the Workgroup will make recommendations before the BIG in May.

Discussion: Address New TMDLs – BIG Region and Outside

Workgroup will discuss new and recently completed TMDLs within the BIG watershed and those adjacent or near the BIG watershed. The BIG charged the Workgroup with reviewing the I-Plan language that allows adding additional watersheds. The Workgroup will determine if a watershed can be added 'conditionally' prior to the TMDL being completed when petitioned by the watershed stakeholders for inclusion in the I-Plan. The Workgroup will develop the process by which watersheds outside the BIG region will be added and any changes that need to be made to the I-Plan or to representation on the BIG.

Discussion: BIG 2014 Annual Report

Workgroup will review the work of BIG workgroups. Workgroup will assist H-GAC by making suggestions and recommendations for each strategy area for the Annual Report:

I-Plan Strategies:

- Implementation Activity 1.0: Wastewater Treatment Facilities
- Implementation Activity 2.0: Sanitary Sewer Systems
- Implementation Activity 3.0: On-site Sewage Facilities
- Implementation Activity 4.0: Stormwater and Land Development
- Implementation Activity 5.0: Construction
- Implementation Activity 6.0: Illicit Discharges and Dumping
- Implementation Activity 7.0: Agriculture and Animal Sources
- Implementation Activity 8.0: Residential
- Implementation Activity 9.0: Monitoring and I-Plan Revision
- Implementation Activity 10.0: Research
- Implementation Activity 11.0: Geographic Priority Framework

Discussion: Wildlife Bacteria Follow-up

Workgroup will discuss information received since 12/16/2013 from TX DOT.

Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

May 27, 2014: BIG Annual Meeting



**Coordination & Policy Workgroup
Meeting Summary
Monday, December 16, 2013
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM
H-GAC Conference Room C, Second Floor**

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions

Michael Bloom, Linda Broach, Ralph Calvino, Richard Chapin, Danielle Cioce, Catherine Elliott, Steve Hupp, Diane Humes, Tom Ivy, Carole Lament, Alisa Max, N. Sam Okonkm, Linda Pechacek, Ceil Price, Linda Shead, Tim Tietjens, Tamara Trow, Kristen Wickert

Review Notes from Last Year's Meeting

Attendees reviewed the notes from last year to assist with the meeting's discussion.

Discussion: BIG's Ground Rules

Workgroup reviewed the BIG's ground rules to determine if any changes were warranted. The City of Houston made edits made to the ground rules and provided those edits to H-GAC staff the morning of the Coordination and Policy meeting. H-GAC staff will review the edits made by the City of Houston and provide an updated draft to the Coordination and Policy noting the edits.

Discussion: Address New TMDLs – BIG Region and Outside

Workgroup discussed new and recently completed TMDLs within the BIG watershed and those adjacent or near the BIG watershed. The BIG charged the Workgroup with reviewing the I-Plan language that allows adding additional watersheds. The Workgroup determined that a watershed could be added prior to the TMDL being completed when petitioned by the watershed stakeholders for inclusion in the I-Plan.

H-GAC staff will revise the language that currently resides in the I-Plan. The revised language will include allowing new watersheds to join so long as there is a TMDL in progress. Staff will then circulate the language to the Coordination and Policy Workgroup for review. Once the language is finalized, the revised language will be sent to the BIG for acceptance. Once the changes are accepted, new watersheds can be added when request is made to the BIG. The request should provide some means of documenting the interest of the watershed's stakeholders (i.e. meeting summary of watershed group voting to join). Coordination and Policy members also recommended that watershed groups electing to join the BIG should seek but are not required to provide letters of support or resolutions from local jurisdictions in support of joining the BIG and willingness to implement the BIG I-Plan.

Discussion: Draft BIG Stormwater Certification and Recognition Program

Workgroup reviewed a draft certification and award program and provided comments and recommend changes to the document. When initiated the Stormwater Certification and Recognition Program will implement the I-Plan's Implementation Activity 4.4: Promote Recognition Programs for Developments that Voluntarily Incorporate Bacteria Reduction Measures. The draft program will be sent to the TCEQ for review and comment.

Discussion: Preparing Workgroups for BIG 2014 Annual Report

Workgroup did not have time to review the upcoming BIG workgroup schedule and expectations for each workgroup. H-GAC staff stated that the Annual Report will follow the same route that took place in 2013. Staff also informed the workgroup that it would be meeting again following all the workgroups and will have an opportunity to review each workgroup's progress.

Discussion: Wildlife Bacteria Contribution

Due to time constraints, this item was moved ahead of the Annual Report discussion. The Workgroup discussed wildlife bacteria contribution and how that contribution is factored into the TMDL calculation. H-GAC staff reported that the wildlife contribution in the Armand TMDL was factored in the NPS calculation. Currently there are insufficient data available to estimate populations and spatial distribution of wildlife and avian species by subwatershed. Consequently it is difficult to assess the magnitude of bacteria contributions from wildlife species as a general category. Members were still interested in what TX Department of Transportation (TX DOT) was doing and asked H-GAC staff to follow-up with TX DOT.

Adjourn

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

May 27, 2014: BIG Annual Meeting

January 23, 2014: Sanitary Sewer Systems

January 7, 2014: Monitoring & Plan Revision

January 16, 2014: Wastewater Treatment Facilities

February 20, 2014: Stormwater System | Construction & Land Development

February 11, 2014: Residential & Outreach

February 13, 2014: Illicit Discharges & Dumping

February 11, 2014: Animals & Agriculture

February 13, 2014: Onsite Sanitary Sewage Facilities

March 11, 2014: Watershed Outreach

March 20, 2014: Monitoring and Plan Revision | Research

March 25, 2014: Coordination and Policy

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, revise, and execute the Implementation Plan for Seventy-Two Total Maximum Daily Loads in the Houston-Galveston Region (I-Plan).

The signatories to these Ground Rules agree as follows:

GOALS

The ultimate goal of the BIG is assisting to reduce bacteria levels in the region's impaired waterways, making them meet water quality standards and become suitable for their current, designated uses. The BIG will strive to accomplish this goal by coordinating, implementing, assessing, and revising the Implementation Plan for Seventy-Two Total Maximum Daily Loads in the Houston-Galveston Region (I-Plan). This I-Plan addresses bacteria loading in waterways for which TMDLs are being done or are completed.

POWERS

The BIG is the decision-making body for the I-Plan. ~~The BIG's powers are to recommend an I-Plan and revisions thereof to the TCEQ for consideration. As such, the BIG will formulate recommendations to be used in drafting and revising 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 and implementation process and is instrumental in obtaining local support for actions aimed at restoring surface water quality in the region.

TIME FRAME

Full implementation of the I-Plan may take decades after its initial approval by TCEQ in January 2013. The BIG shall function until the completion of a revision and update of to the I-Plan, five years after the approval of the I-Plan by TCEQ, and thereafter as may continue to function throughout this period as a recommendation of the I-Plan or the 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 in 2008.

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 theyit will have the ability to add members. New members will be asked to sign-on to the I-Plan to demonstrate the commitment to actively implement the I-Plan.

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 implementation activities;
- Prioritize implementation activities to achieve goals established in the I-Plan;
- Review and update the I-Plan and timetable for implementation;
- Lead the effort in implementing this plan at the local level;
- Develop a monitoring plan;
- Participate in revisions to the I-Plan if revisions are warranted~~Communicate implications of the I-Plan to other stakeholders in the watershed; and~~
- Encourage other~~Seek to obtain commitments from watershed stakeholders to implement activities of the I-Plan.~~

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

H-GAC will serve as the facilitator for meetings of the BIG as funding is available. 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. Workgroups shall try to recruit participants from the broader community as a means of increasing stakeholder participation.

Each workgroup will be composed of a minimum of at least one BIG member that will serve as a liaison to the BIG and additional individuals with a vested interest in that topic. There is no limit to the number of members on a workgroup. At each workgroup meeting or as appropriate, each workgroup will elect a liaison to the BIG to provide an update on the activities of the workgroup to the BIG, as necessary. The liaison will be, in order of preference, a BIG member, an alternate to a BIG member, or a representative recommended by participants.

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.~~ The workgroups also serve as a forum in which alternate perspectives should be sought and considered.

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. The BIG shall consider workgroup participants when filling vacancies on the BIG.

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.

Alternates must abide by these ground rules. 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. Absences from two annual meetings in a row of which the facilitator was not informed of beforehand or without designation of an alternate constitute a resignation from the BIG. H-GAC will contact each member who has an absence to remind them of the rule.

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 any revision to the I-Plan.

From time to time, the BIG may make decisions through e-mail, web survey, or other remote means. In general, such decisions will be administrative in nature and shall be consistent with 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 to the public and all interested stakeholders are welcome. At BIG meetings, discussion will be primarily among BIG members (or alternates sitting in place of members). Questions or comments from the audience will be addressed at the close of

each discussion topic, and will be generally no more than five minutes. Interested stakeholders are encouraged to participate in workgroups.

The BIG shall meet at least twice each year, at an annual meeting and at a mid-year update. The BIG may determine the need for additional meetings. Meetings will be scheduled to accomplish specific milestones in the planning and revision process. Workgroups will set their own meeting schedule to coordinate with BIG meetings, tasks, and milestones, and will generally meet at least once each year in preparation for the annual meeting.

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 all 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 suggested 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.

SHARING OF/RELEASE OF 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 GROUNDRULES

~~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

Marilyn Christian

Joe Clark

Robert Collins

Carol Ellinger

Catherine Elliot

Mike Garver

Frank Green

Teague Harris

Bruce Heiberg

Shannon Hicks

Jason Iken

Tom Ivy

Ron Kelling

Helen Lane

Craig T. Maske

Cathy McCoy

Michael Mooney

Jack Murphy

Rebecca Olive

Mitchell G. Page

Raymond Pavlovich

Linda Pechacek

Ceil Price

Kathy Richolson

Jim Robertson

Linda Shead

Brian Shmaefsky

Scott Jones Bob Stokes

Michael TurcoLee

Update to New TMDLs (infill) and New Watersheds (additions)

New TMDLs

1. Appendix I. Eighteen Total Maximum Daily Loads for Bacteria in Buffalo and Whiteoak Bayous and Tributaries For Segment Numbers 1013, 1013A, 1013C, 1014, 1014A, 1014B, 1014E, 1014H, 1014K, 1014L, 1014M, 1014N, 1014O, 1017, 1017A, 1017B, 1017D, and 1017E
2. Appendix II. Fifteen Total Maximum Daily Loads for Indicator Bacteria in Watersheds Upstream of Lake Houston For Segment Numbers 1004E, 1008, 1008H, 1009, 1009C, 1009D, 1009E, 1010, and 1011

New Watersheds

Armand:

1. Committee sign-off letter (see attached draft letter)
2. Seeking letters of support from watershed stakeholders

BIG:

1. Revised I-Plan language to accept new watersheds (Armand)
2. Sign Letter accepting charge of new watersheds.

I-Plan Watershed Language - Revised

I-Plan: 9.4.5, pg. 98

9.4.5: Expand the geographic scope of the I-Plan as appropriate

Communities and stakeholders within the region are encouraged to participate in the I-Plan activities, either informally and voluntarily, or formally upon incorporation by the BIG into the I-Plan. Voluntary action is particularly encouraged in those watersheds with streams that are impaired for bacteria but which do not yet have adopted TMDLs.

As other watersheds in the vicinity of the BIG project area have TMDLs currently in-progress or adopted by the TCEQ, stakeholders from those watersheds may petition the BIG to consider incorporating those watersheds into the I-Plan. The BIG may elect to formally approve the petition through a vote during the annual meeting or may decide through a vote taken up by email. Approving a petition through either method will follow the BIG decision-making process found in the ground rules. Petitioners should provide some form of documentation (e.g., submitting the petition signed by all approved watershed stakeholders or meeting minutes containing language describing the stakeholder's vote to join the BIG) that provides evidence to the fact that watershed stakeholders agree to join the BIG. Additionally, the BIG encourages but does not require petitioning stakeholders to seek letters of support or resolutions from local jurisdictions in support of joining the BIG and willingness to implement the I-Plan. Should the petition be accepted by the BIG, the I-Plan will be updated to reflect the addition of the new watershed. The updated plan will be approved during the BIG Annual Meeting.

From time to time, additional watershed segments within the BIG project area will undergo bacteria TMDLs. The TCEQ will notify the BIG that new TMDLs have been completed for watersheds within the BIG. The BIG may ask the TCEQ to provide a formal presentation on the topic of these new TMDL segments during the next BIG meeting. The I-Plan will be updated to reflect the new segments and the BIG will formally approved the changes to the I-Plan during the annual meeting of the BIG.

9.4.5: Expand the geographic scope of the I-Plan as appropriate

~~As other watersheds in the vicinity have TMDLs adopted by the TCEQ, stakeholders from those watersheds may petition the BIG to consider incorporating those watersheds into the I-Plan. These requests shall be considered by the BIG as part of its annual review of the I-Plan. Communities and stakeholders within the region are encouraged to participate in I-Plan activities, either informally and voluntarily, or formally upon incorporation by the BIG into the I-Plan. Voluntary action is particularly encouraged in those watersheds with streams that are impaired for bacteria but which do not yet have adopted TMDLs.~~

Mr. Ron Stein, Program Lead
Total Maximum Daily Load Program
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
MC-203
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

Subject: Letter of Support from the Armand Bayou Implementation Plan Coordination Committee for Armand Bayou to Join the Bacteria Implementation Group

Dear Mr. Stein,

The Armand Bayou Implementation Plan Coordination Committee (Coordination Committee) asks to join the Bacteria Implementation Group (BIG) in order to satisfy the requirements of an Implementation Plan (I-Plan) for bacteria in the Armand Bayou watershed. This I-Plan is the effort made to achieve the water quality standard for contact recreation in the bayou (Segment 1113).

The Armand Bayou I-Plan process started in January 2013 when the Coordination Committee was formed to represent the jurisdictions, agencies, and other entities that are stakeholders in the watershed. The Coordination Committee formed work groups to review the BIG document and applicable data from the University of Houston technical study. After a few months of deliberation, the Coordination Committee voted in August to request to join the BIG. Coordination Committee members were present at the BIG semi-annual meeting in October to request to join the BIG after the technical presentation to the BIG.

Representatives from all cities and counties and political jurisdictions in the Armand Bayou watershed were invited to meetings and are represented on the Coordination Committee. Several of the jurisdictions were already affected by the BIG as they include other watersheds already included in the BIG area and are members of the Joint Task Force.

The Coordination Committee has reviewed the BIG I-Plan and understands that it can be used as a menu of potential implementation measures as applicable for their watershed. The Armand Bayou Watershed is a unique area in the region. It has more natural areas than the surrounding region, is inhabited by more wildlife and used more heavily for recreation; there is also less development than is typical throughout the region. Therefore, the watershed will use the measures from the BIG I-Plan that address these unique characteristics.

Thank you for the opportunity to work together on improving water quality in Armand Bayou.

Sincerely,

The Armand Bayou Implementation Plan Coordination Committee