



**Joint Work Group Meeting:  
Coordination & Policy and Plan Revision work groups  
DRAFT Meeting Notes  
Thursday, March 28, 2013  
10:00 AM to noon  
H-GAC Conference Room C, Second Floor**

### **Attendees**

Linda Broach (TCEQ), Richard Chapin (City of Houston), Danielle Cioce (Harris County PID), Andrew Henderson (interested individual), Jonathan Holley (Harris County FCD), Tom Ivy (Texas Stream Team), Helen Lane (Houston Audubon), Jason Maldonado (LAN), Alisa Max (Harris County PID), Linda Pechacek on phone (LDP Engineering), Rachel Powers (H-GAC), Linda Shead (Texas Coastal Partners), Robert Snoza (Harris County FCD)

### **Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions**

Rachel called the meeting to order and initiated self-introductions.

### **Review Notes from Last Year**

Rachel indicated that there were no notes because the group had not met since 2011 except as an informal ad hoc committee to discuss the annual report format. Meeting notes were provided for the rest of the work groups that have met since the mid-year meeting.

### **Update on I-Plan Approval Process**

The TCEQ unanimously approved the BIG I-Plan on January 30, 2013. The approved version included the changes to the I-Plan that had been discussed at previous BIG meetings.

### **Review Annual Report format**

Rachel explained that the conceptual format for the annual report was developed in collaboration by the BIG and agreed to at the BIG mid-year meeting in October 2012. The report will consist of three main components:

- 1) At-a-Glance: The At-a-Glance section will be one 11x17 paper that includes cover page with a photo; a table of implementation activities, proposed milestones, and an evaluation of progress; and a sheet with background information, a map, and high-level review of progress overall.
- 2) A printed report: In addition to a narrative overview, the printed report will include information about progress and goals for each of the strategies in the plan. Each strategy will be described by a narrative description preceded by a tabular summary sheet, which will include recommendations from the workgroup to the BIG regarding progress, achievements, focus for the coming year, and revisions to the I-Plan.
- 3) Web-based support documents: If additional information, such as lengthy tables, are necessary, these will be provided in an on-line format.

Rachel noted that H-GAC is hiring a consultant to put the report together since she will be with H-GAC for only a limited time. She thought that having a consultant put together a slick progress report would be really great, because it would set the standard for future reports and as an example for other watershed groups.

**Review Implementation Progress--** The workgroup reviewed progress for each of the implementation activities, with a focus on the following activities:

#### Implementation Strategy 9.0: Monitoring and I-Plan Revision

- Activities—The first three activities were discussed at the joint meeting of the Research, Watershed Outreach, and Monitoring & I-Plan Revision work groups on March 7, 2013. This discussion will focus on Implementation Activity 9.4.
  - 9.1: Continue to Utilize Ambient Water Quality Monitoring and Data Analysis
  - 9.2: Conduct and Coordinate Non-Ambient Water Quality Monitoring
  - 9.3: Create and Maintain a Regional Implementation Activity Database
  - 9.4: Assess Monitoring Results and Modify I-Plan
    - 9.4.1: Assess data
      1. *Does ambient water quality monitoring data indicate that implementation activities are reducing bacteria loading?*
      2. *Do non-ambient water quality monitoring data indicate that implementation activities are reducing bacteria loading?*
      3. *Are implementation activities and controls being undertaken as described in this I-Plan? Which activities have been implemented and which have not?*
    - 9.4.2: Communicate results
    - 9.4.3: Continue the BIG
    - 9.4.4: Update the I-Plan
    - 9.4.5: Expand the geographic scope of the I-Plan as appropriate
- Discussion
  - Rachel highlighted the three questions posed in 9.4.1.
    - Ambient Water Quality: H-GAC, TCEQ, and Clean Rivers Program monitors continued to sample the water. Analysis suggests the following highlights:
      - The 10 waterways on the “most wanted list” (with the highest bacteria levels) in general showed improvement. Some of them, such as Little White Oak Bayou and Schramm Gully, showed marked drops in bacteria levels. In these two instances, stakeholders have been undertaking activities that could easily be construed to have caused the drop, although there is no evidence.
      - The 10 waterways on the “most likely to succeed list” (with the lowest bacteria levels that still exceed the standard) in general showed degradation, although it was relatively minor degradation. These streams are important because if we can get them off the list of impaired waterways, it would be a coup for stakeholders because they would be meeting the delisting goal of the TMDL

program. The group indicated that it would like to focus on these streams more in the coming year.

- In general, the BIG line continues to show progress, although it is not clear whether progress has been made in the past year. H-GAC will review the data to see whether there has been a statistically significant decline (or increase) in the past year. The group hypothesized that the lack of clear improvement might be, effectively, reconciliation after a year of drought.
- The group agreed that stakeholders need to continue efforts to improve water quality. They had hoped that improvement would be more marked, even though the “most wanted” successes are notable.

- Non-Ambient Water Quality Monitoring

- H-GAC has submitted a QAPP to the TCEQ, HCFCD is about to launch its BMP database, and the JTF and BPA has done limited non-ambient sampling. Overall, however, few conclusions can be drawn from the work that has been done.

- Implementation activities

- 

- 

## **Identify Activities on Which to Focus Efforts**

**Identify Possible Revisions to the I-Plan**—No workgroups recommended changes to the Implementation Plan.

## **Confirm Recommendations to the BIG for Annual Report**

Based on recommendations of the BIG at the October 2012 mid-year meeting, the Coordination & Policy Work Group, along with the plan revision group of the Monitoring & Plan Revision Work Group, will review the recommendations from the work groups prior to consideration at the BIG annual meeting in May.

Meeting participants will consider the following:

- Status of activities (not started/in progress/complete, ahead/on/behind schedule)
- Progress
- Achievements
- Focus
- Revisions

Review recommendations and strategy cover sheets from work groups for various 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

## **Adjourn**

**BIG Annual Meeting: Tuesday, May 14, 2013**

**Tentative 2014 Coordination & Policy work group meeting: March 27, 2013, 10:00 AM**