



STAKEHOLDER MEETING 15

July 19, 2016

5:30 PM

Double Bayou Community Building

MEETING SUMMARY

Stakeholders: Raymond Anders, David Boyd, Tom Douglas, Norma Ezer, Leroy Ezer, Larry George, Sarah Gossett, Elga Jackson, Guy R. Jackson, Charles Johnson, Nate Johnson, David Manthei, Ollie Mayes, Creola Moore, Alice Rivon, Bob Scherer, Jerry Shadden, Phillip Stewart, David Thruston, Rex Tunze, Otho Turner, Kay Willcox, Pudge Willcox, Tracy Woody

Team Members: Ryan Bare (HARC), Stephanie Glenn (HARC), Brian Koch (TSSWCB), Lisa Marshall (GBEP), Brandie Minchew (Shead), Linda Shead

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Linda Shead welcomed and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She expressed special thanks to Tracy Woody and Jeri's Seafood for providing the wrap-up meeting dinner. She noted that there would be additional celebration refreshments later. She expressed thanks to Chambers County for its continued support: Precinct 2 for the meeting room, Emergency Management for the screen, the Economic Development Office for the PA system, and the Parks Department for getting inmates to set up the tables and chairs. She noted that Precinct 2 Commissioner Larry George was in attendance, and thanked him. She also noted that JP Tracy Woody was in attendance.

Linda reviewed the goals for the evening's meeting, which were: to provide an update on the WPP document, implementation updates, to share the Overview document, to consider the method for distribution of the final WPP document, and adjourn to celebrate.

With a few new people in attendance, Linda passed the microphone around for self-introductions. She then noted the building logistics and available handouts, including a copy of the PowerPoint presentation about the project that was given to Commissioners' Court at their meeting last week.

2. WPP Document

Linda noted that EPA had accepted the WPP document (copy of letter provided) – with a few small additions/changes – as following the nine elements for successful implementation. She reminded folks that only stakeholders approve, but EPA acceptance means eligibility for implementation funding.

4800 Research Forest Drive The Woodlands, Texas 77381 Tel: 281-367-1348 www.doublebayou.org

Double Bayou Watershed Partnership is a project of the following entities:



HARC



Stephanie Glenn covered the EPA comments and the additions/changes that HARC provided in response to those comments. These were provided in the handout. She summarized each change, and answered any questions:

- *General (minor formatting changes)* – consistency in the labeling of Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, plus changes in the Table of Contents and Lists of Figures/Tables and page numbers, to accommodate all additions/changes.

Specific additions are highlighted in the handout, and are new text not seen before by stakeholders. Other changes are redlined.

- *Data gaps* – HARC added a section to chapter 4 to address data gaps. The final paragraph identifies the specific data gap issues that will need to be addressed going forward: quantitative flow data; complete spatial coverage of the watershed; and focus on routine ambient monitoring of the four primary stations, with only rainfall events for the wastewater treatment plant station. Extra time was given for stakeholders to review the added language.

Q: Time intervals for routine monitoring?

A: Proposal was submitted to continue monitoring as before, but the funding level may not provide for all of that monitoring (that is, quarterly at all four stations, plus certain rainfall events).

The stakeholders approved this addition, and the previous general/formatting changes.

- *EPA role in grant program* – HARC added language (in the chapter on potential funding sources) identifying that EPA provides funding for the §106 state water pollution control programs.

Q: Will this funding be requested from EPA?

A: Not necessarily this program, and everyone will know if funding is being applied for.

Stakeholders had no objections to this addition.

- *Specifying bacteria for load reductions* – HARC added a note to Table 8-3 that the units in the table are cfu for *E. coli*, but the actual load reductions will be measured according to the appropriate bacteria indicator, depending on location (saltwater or freshwater) in the watershed.

Q: CFU vs. MPN?

A: The units are comparable, and this is explained more thoroughly earlier in the document.

Stakeholders had no objections to this addition.

- *Total expected load reduction* – HARC summed the total for all of the separate load reductions in Table 8-3, and added it to the text: 1.9×10^{13} cfu.

Stakeholders had no objections to this addition.

- *Course corrections* – HARC added a paragraph about adaptive management in response to monitoring results and local conditions.

Q: How will it be decided if measures are to be added?

A: The group will decide, and be brought together to discuss what's working or not.

Q: Second sentence should state that it will come back to the group.

A: This is found in another place in the paragraph: "...to coordinate with stakeholders..."

Stakeholders had no objections to this addition.

- *Monitoring for meeting standards* – HARC added a paragraph to detail how the monitoring plan will be used to evaluate whether water quality standards are being met and/or whether corrective strategies are needed.

Stakeholders had no objections to this addition.

Q: If a problem arises and a specific source is identified, can the action be addressed at that location.

A: Yes, especially if data show that is the source.

Linda reiterated that these requested changes are not extensive, and that it was a great accomplishment. Brian noted that EPA liked not just the content, but also how well it's put together. He also noted that it's how hard the group worked that got this approval done.

3. Implementation Update

Brian Koch reported Trinity Bay SWCD had applied for a grant last year, and that grant for the WQMP technician position was approved, and they are just waiting for the funding from EPA for the technician to get hired and get to work. The technician will work on status reviews of existing plans, and then work with those landowners to help implement the plans, including some funding for the practices. The position will be shared with Cedar Bayou watershed, and based in Anahuac at the NRCS office. It will probably be in the fall when someone is hired and in place.

In the most recent grant cycle, HARC submitted a new §319 proposal for surface water quality monitoring. The request was for continuing at the same stations, frequency and constituents as before, except fewer for the wastewater discharge, since no indications of problems there during normal weather conditions.

In terms of watershed coordination, meetings will probably not be as often, and will be for updates on plan progress. We'll also be visiting with some stakeholders about some specific implementation measures. Additionally, we'll be looking for 319 funding and other funding sources.

Linda reiterated that other funding is needed, and especially for a local watershed coordinator. (This will be her last month on the project.) Brian noted that some of the workshops (e.g, feral hogs, etc.) could be brought back again.

Brian also noted how dedicated and engaged this group was, and that it was motivating to him to help with implementation. He thanked everyone.

4. WPP Overview Document

Linda distributed the Overview document that HARC had prepared.

5. Plans for Final WPP Document Distribution

With all the changes approved, HARC will go into production mode to get the plans printed and bound. Linda asked about how best to get copies to the stakeholders, to be sure that everyone gets a copy. Some noted that they want it only electronically, and it will be available that way on the website. About half want hard copies. Linda will provide a sheet to sign up for that, and then get in

touch individually to make sure those who want a hard copy get one. Some copies can also go to Comm. George's office and to David Manthei's office.

6. Final Wrap-up, Announcements, and Thanks!

David Manthei announced the upcoming Local Workgroup Meeting on August 3, with info on the table. The Local Workgroup is for anyone who has interest in conservation in Chambers County, and will help determine the focus of funding for the local office. Linda noted that their funding can help implement the plan. David requested an rsvp.

Stephanie announced the resiliency workshop that AgriLife's Texas Coastal Watershed Program will be hosting at White's Park on July 21. Linda will check about getting an email about it out to folks tomorrow.

Linda noted thanks due to all who helped get us to this point:

- Everyone at the County who helped make the meetings possible (building, sound system, set-up/take-down of tables and chairs)
- Refreshment sponsors (on flip chart), with most providing meals twice (and Samson four times):
 - Chambers County
 - ChaRT
 - Chambers County Appraisal District / Guy Jackson
 - Chambers-Liberty Counties Navigation District
 - Galveston Bay Foundation
 - Jeri's Seafood
 - Samson Energy
 - Shead Conservation Solutions
 - Trinity Bay Conservation District
 - Trinity Bay SWCD #434
 - Texas AgriLife Extension Service
- All the various presenters at meetings and workshops who provided background, updated data / information, and technical resources
- Workgroup members for their participation, expertise, and diligence, in making sure our information was correct, and that the most appropriate management measures were considered and evaluated
- All the stakeholder participants at general meetings who gave their time and input, for three-plus years, to a process that resulted in a workable, stakeholder-approved WPP
- Folks who attended the workshops to learn still more
- USGS for water quality sample collection
- HARC folks for analyzing the data, presenting it, and preparing the WPP document such that EPA accepted it
- TSSWCB and GBEP for funding!
- TSSWCB whose experience helped to guide the process in a way that worked!
- Shead Conservation assistants (Brandie, Abby, Danielle and others) for their meeting help – before, during and after the meetings

Linda and the team were thanked for their work on the project.

7. Adjourn to Celebrate!