

Meeting Summary for Copano Bay Stakeholder Facilitation  
 January 30, 2012  
 5:30 – 7:30

Attendees:

<u>First</u>	<u>Last</u>	<u>Initials</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Brian	Yanta		Goliad CEA
Will	Blackwell		NRCS
D. G	Randle		Refugio Co. WCID #2
Ricky	Piwetz		Refugio Co. WCID #3
Kai	Buckert		Rancher
Ginger	Easton-Smith		Aransas CEA
Darrin	Schmidt		
Connie	Waters		CFB Family, Ltd
Brett	Huegele		McFaddin Enterprises
Terry	Blankenship		Welder Wildlife Foundation
Beth	Alvarez		NRA
Bland	Proctor		Braman Ranches
Christopher	Mace		TPWD - Coastal
Alex	Nunez		TPWD - Coastal
James	Dodson		Naismith Engineering
Jimmy	Rathkamp		Copano Bay SWCD
Trent	Teinert		TPWD
Delbert	Cox		Refugio Co Citizen
Don	Sugarek		Texas Farm Bureau
Gerardo	Aranbide		TCEQ R-14
Mike	Barber		Papalote Ranch
Jace	Tunnell		CBBEP
Earl	Matthew M.D.		Aransas First
Leslie	Casterline		Aransas County
Larry	Dierlan		Martin O'Connor Company
Tammy	Brooks		TNC
Aaron	Wendt		TSSWCB
Mitch	Conine		TSSWCB
Troy	Berthold		Bee SWCD
Jose	De Leon		LNx
Ann	Lopez		Refugio County
J. D.	McGuill		Copano Bay SWCD
Dallas	Ford		Copano Bay SWCD
Rod	Bernal		Refugio Co
Jack	Chaney		Aransas County

Rick	Anselmo		Refugio
Matt	Bochet		Bee CEA
Trace	Claybrook		Refugio Co
Rocky	Freund		NRA
Michael	Sasser		Dan A. Hughes Co.
Roger	Miranda		TCEQ
Leroy	Wolff		NRCS
Brent	Clayton		AgriLife - CC
Tony	Fanklin		TSSWCB
Joe	Keefe		O'Connor Brothers
David	Mundine		TFB
Kelly	Ruble		TCEQ
Morgan	O'Brien		O'Brien Ranch
Durwood	Boeneg		Copano Bay SWCD
Ginger	Hallinan		Aransas WQC
Sam	Sugarek		NRA
Richard	Eyster		TDA
Allen	Berthold	B	TWRI
Kevin	Wagner	W	TWRI
Duane	Campion		San Patricio CEA
Michael	Donalson		Refugio CEA
Ray	Allen		CBBEF
Tom	Callan		City of Rockport
Jim	Bluntzer		Goliad SWCD
John	Dreier		Goliad SWCD
Richard	Beall		McFaddin Enterprises
Kirk	Feuerbacher		TNC
Karen	Meador		TPWD
Bill	Jones		DM O'Connor Ranches
Rusty	Ray		TSSWCB
Chico	Cravens		
Robert	Thomas		
Joe	Paschal		
Henry	Bekum		
Kierston	Madden		Mission-Aransas NERR

---

## Meeting Agenda

### Public Meeting to Address Water Quality in Copano Bay and Its Watershed

January 30, 2012  
5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

Refugio County Community Center  
305 Swift Street  
Refugio, TX 78377

---

The purpose of this meeting is to inform participants about general water quality and how it impacts Copano Bay and its watershed. The Copano Bay watershed primarily occupies portions of Bee, Goliad, San Patricio, Refugio and Aransas counties. Topics discussed will include a general overview of water quality and bacteria in Copano Bay and its watershed; a brief history of previous efforts that have occurred in the area to address water quality issues; and alternatives to addressing water quality impairments with in-depth descriptions about the Total Maximum Daily Load and Watershed Protection Planning Process. A discussion of next steps will conclude the meeting.

## Meeting Agenda

5:30 – Welcome, Introductions, and Purpose (Duane Campion, San Patricio County Extension Agent)

5:40 – Overview and Review of Water Quality and Previous Efforts in Copano Bay and Its Watershed (Allen Berthold, TWRI)

6:10 – Alternatives Available to Address Water Quality Impairments (Kevin Wagner, TWRI)

- Overview of Alternatives
- Explanation of Total Maximum Daily Load Process
- Explanation of Watershed Protection Plan Process

7:10 – Open Discussion (Allen Berthold, TWRI)

- Next Step – Stakeholder Selection of Method to Address Impairment
- Set Next Meeting Date – March 2012

7:30 – Adjourn Meeting

**Presentations:**

B – Presentation of an overview of the Clean Water Act, what it’s purpose is, who administers it, how water quality standards are set, and how waterbodies end up on the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. An overview of the different sources of bacteria and how that bacteria gets into the creeks was covered. Finally, an overview of past activities in the Copano Bay watershed to address the bacteria impairment was provided.

K – Presentation of an overview of the alternatives to addressing a water quality impairment, beginning with the Watershed Action Planning process. An overview of the Recreational Use Attainability Analysis was provide. Total Maximum Daily Loads paired with Implementation Plans were discussed in detail as well as Watershed Protection Plans. Finally, a side by side comparison of the two different approaches was provided.

**Discussion:**

Stakeholder S

Unidentified Answer A

S. How many waste water treatment plants do we currently have discharging into this watershed?

A. Quite a few, about twelve.

S. One of the things we’ve done in Aransas County is developed a subdivision ordinance that is a lot more intensive than other things. When you look at the sources going into the watershed, most of the folks that are doing that now, the waste water treatment plants, the ranchers and the people that live out there are monitoring their water conditions right now. But the subdivision ordinance that the state allows the county to do is very restrictive. We can come in and check the septic systems, but there is no real impetus from the state to allow counties to require waste water facilities other than just onsite mitigation of waste. Until you can get away from that, individual septic tanks will maintain...but whenever you start getting septic tanks that are older, and when you have 100 or 200 within a mile of a water body then you do have problems. Right now there is no real way to economically to enforce a better standard of treating waste water and effluent. I know that I have a small utility district on the Copano and we just spent 700,000 dollars getting a permit approved by the TCEQ. So it becomes so cumbersome that a lot of development areas are just not trying to take on that large cost. It’s just incredible how difficult it is achieve what the TCEQ is requiring. One of the things we found out when getting that waste water treatment plant permit, we found out that Copano Bay has not really been mapped as far as pollution goes or any of the constituents over a long time. I believe someone started in the last six or seven years and there was no provision for wet years vs. dry years. They just assumed everything was going to be a dry year and that is just not the case. Some of the standards that TCEQ and EPA have, they may be fine coming off of Lake Michigan with 40 million people up there; but when you got 147 customers and it costs 700,000 dollars for a permit, that is stupid. That is the reason why people are having such a problem with getting developments to look at this. It took us three and a half years to get a permit for 147 customers. We looked at phosphorus loading; we looked at nitrates, nitrogen, TDS, BOD. We looked at everything and we have the same standards as they do in over the aquifer in Austin. And it still cost 700,000 dollars to get the permit; it added half a million to upgrade the plant.

W. I know that is a primary issue across the state. My experience with working with groups like this, is I've seen work groups set up just to see what was the best way to address that, and these are included in the plans. Not only that, but I could see setting up a work group to specifically address an issue like that; made up of folks like yourself and the county folks that are responsible for septic tanks and things like that...get TCEQ to the table to discuss what opportunities there are in dealing with things like that.

S. What's the next step? I know you said there is a lot more...is a meeting the next step?

B. So really the point of this meeting was to bring up the ongoing issues with Copano Bay. We know what has gone on and now here is the approach we are taking to address compliance with the clean water act. This meeting was to get the information out there. Here are the facts on the two types of plans and at the next meeting in March...we'll give you time between now and then to review things. Call me if you have any questions whatsoever. At the next meeting we will decide, more or less the lesser of two evils of how to address the water quality. We did allow a lot of time for questions. I can recap what we talked about...the federal clean water act requires states to set standards, the state monitors the water to see if it meets those standards. When it is not, it is placed on the 303(d) list and it requires that some action be taken to address...these two plans do provide some opportunity. It is not just in this area. It is happening all over the state.

S. Could you comment on the relative scale of processes in terms of cost and where that money might come from. And also in terms of time for the stakeholders to develop these things...

B. As far as potential costs, the TMDL plan costs approximately 100,000 to 200,000 dollars.

A. It depends on what the stakeholders want to accomplish in the project.

B. At the point we are at now, we have data...we can choose to develop the TMDL and implementation plan. It will take roughly one year with maybe bimonthly meetings at a couple of hours per meeting until we get it developed. Once we get it developed, it may take annual meetings to review where we are and if added practices are needed. The local level would decide these things.

S. What will it take to change the bacteria level in Copano Bay?

A. One of the issues at the mouth of the bay is...the EPA says you have to sample one foot below the surface of the water on the slack tide, mid outgoing tide, where there is no settlement lift from the bottom. Anybody that lives or fishes down here knows the bay near Aransas can go from clear to muddy in two hours' time. That means you got settlement uplift, that means bacteria is 80 to 100 times higher than in the ideal conditions. My view is that with the sampling techniques we've done, we have never really sampled under the strict guidelines of the EPA. So I really do believe, that if we implement a TMDL, that actually looks at the standard it would increase our problem tremendously because we are not really getting good data now. When was the last time you found four clear days of slack tide and low wind at the mouth of the Mission River and Aransas Bay. We will never solve that problem because that is primarily sediment uplift in two or three foot deep water. The studies that were done were done in deep swimming recreational areas, Lake Erie, Lake Keystone, Anatulsa and I think the Atlantic City Beach. They had at least 5,000 people a day swim in those areas. They sampled under those conditions and gave a questionnaire to the people using that beach and they then decided that it had twice as much disease, like 20 cases per 1,000 if the bacteria count was over the minimal standard...you had half that rate if it was

below the standard. Those guidelines on how to establish the effects of tide and types of sediment and how to achieve a really good sample are nearly impossible to achieve on the Texas coast. I think we are looking at not so good data, but we can fix it if we sample correctly to the EPA standard which is set and a lot of our problems will be resolved. But we can't do anything about wind and sediment in the mouth of the Mission River and Copano Bay. That is going to be an eternal problem and we are just going to have to accept that. The other thing the EPA says if you get above your baseline you need to go looking for a leach field leak or whatever and that is just good common sense. If you got a base line at an area and it suddenly goes away, something went wrong and you gotta find out why. They go through a list of criteria to see what are the variables. So it's a problem where we can improve our data a great deal if we sample the way they sampled when they set the standard and we will learn from it. But we are not going to be able to sample every day or once a week on Tuesdays. You gotta sample a stream when its running. You can't go to a stagnant pool when its warm. What happens when its warm? Bacteria grows...we have to learn how to sample correctly and then a lot of our problems will go away.

S. One of the things Dr. Matthews has talked about before is that Copano Bay is basically a closed bay. It has barrier islands and few inlets or outlets. Aransas County is working on opening up Cedar Bayou and Vincent Slough so more fresh water can enter. That is a real problem, it's the river, if water can't get out it backs up and affects the rivers too. Dr. Matthews is exactly right on the fact that to get a good cross section of what the bay is doing you have to have a large sample from the basin. You can't take seven samples and place them randomly, three in Aransas Bay and four in Copano Bay, because Copano Bay feeds into Aransas Bay and Aransas bay doesn't go anywhere except up and down the intercostal waterway. It's almost a closed system without a loop, but the secret before you can make any judgments is you got to get good sampling in not only lean years but good years. Then you can monitor what you've got something coming in from waste water treatment plants or something coming in from developments or changes coming in from the last operation or whatever. Right now they are just not there. When we looked at our permit, there was not enough data there to make a good decision. We need sampling and sampling correctly, absolutely.

B. So in some sort of implementation plan, that could be a recommendation made and that would help prioritize some of the funds from the state to come do that special sampling and make sure this listing is in fact based on good data.

S. So since the last general public meeting in December 2007 has no additional sampling been done? And if it has what does that data say?

B. I don't know what the data says, I haven't looked at it. Sam, I don't know exactly where the sampling sites are.

S. Do you know where we could get a hold of that data?

B. Its on the TCEQ SWQM database but I'd have to download it and send it to you because it is a lot easier. It's pretty hard to access and download.

S. Yes it is.

A. We have the CRP quarterly data that is accessible on the Nueces River Authority website and we do have the data from the special study we did.

S. When you talk about the watershed protection plan and the TMDL...can you speak to the success of any of these in Texas. Have there been any water bodies removed from the 303(d) list. It doesn't sound like there is a very high success rate under the WPP.

B. That is right, it is a rigorous process to remove a water body off the 303(d) list through a Watershed Protection Plan. The one that it has occurred with is Plum creek which is just south of Austin. Any TMDL developed in the state results in a removal from the 303(d) list.

S. Does it result in the bacteria being cleaned up?

B. It does not. It will remove it off the EPA's radar per say. If the implementation plan is developed and implemented then that would resolve the bacteria issue.

W. I have something to add to that. Unfortunately with TMDLs or WPPs in Texas we haven't seen astronomical clean ups of water quality unfortunately with either one. I know at Lake Aquillia, there was a TMDL done on that for Atrazine in the late 90's early 2000's...that water quality issue was resolved there. I think there are a handful of two or three others, but out of a large number of TMDLs and the watershed plans that have been in place so far, we haven't seen these huge changes in water quality. But these things take time. If you started today implementing all kinds of conservation practices and working on waste water plants it still may take several years to achieve those standards. That has been my observations working around the state.

S. Have you all studied LCRA's plan? LCRA has a plan for the highland lakes for the last forty years where you can't have anything within a 2,500 foot radius of any feeders. I guess it comes from the south of Lake O.H. Ivie Reservoir and you know the highland lakes are about as pristine as you're going to get. They have had a real success, although it hasn't always been real user friendly.

W. I have been to a few of their meetings with the LCRA on that and how they basically have some kinds of zoning in that area adjacent to the lake there so they can hopefully ensure some quality.

A. I live on Lake Travis, and during periods of high flow, flooding, which we haven't seen for a while; even when it does that it's still not good for swimming. The LCRA puts up on their website, 'unfit for recreation due to high bacteria levels.' During high flow periods you are never going to get a clean sample and the same thing goes for down here.

S. Kevin, in one of the bullets ya'll had comparing watershed protection plans vs. TMDLs...where the TMDLs were more specific for a particular pollutant whereas the WPP was a more holistic approach. So does Copano Bay, or Mission River have any other water quality concerns identified by the TCEQ?

W. I think there is a dissolved oxygen issues in one of the segments

B. In the Aransas portion there were a couple concerns with some nutrients if I remember right.

W. Aaron, you had asked something about the monitoring by the soil and water conservation board preformed the past few years, the Nueces River Authority does put out a basins highlight report on an annual basis. The 2010 report has got a table, I don't know if these are the final conclusion, but it shows what the geometric mean was at each one of the sample sites as well as the WWTPs they sampled from October 2007 until March of 2010.

A. We sampled through January 2011.

W. so this doesn't have all the data but it does have a big chunk of it. So just looking through the data, there are quite a few areas that certainly exceed the water quality standard. Aaron, I don't know if you've looked through this at any great detail.

A. I have. I wasn't sure if the stakeholders have seen it though.

W. And really, there was only two or three of the waste water treatment plants that had some noticeably high concentrations of the twelve...I see four here that stand out. *E. coli* for instance, the standard is 126...eight of them are probably six or below. The concentration is at six or less, but there are four of them that are at 50 all the way up to 550.

S. Are those random samples or did they know they were coming?

A. They were unannounced samples. When we first started, we tried to get three days in a row where we were chasing rain events in order to catch the first flush and then for two consecutive days look for die off. At the same time we sampled WWTPs; if at the first day they didn't know we were coming, the next two days they knew we were coming.

S. And that's not ya'll...it's not annual...

A. This is just for the special study for the soil board.

S. It doesn't have anything to do with TCEQ inspections right?

A. No, it does not. These were not to be used for enforcement.

S. Do these vary much from what the TCEQ saw?

A. I'd have to look in the past history results. They do inspections on our plants no more than once every two and a half to three years in our region. I'd have to go back and check to see the compliance...they also have to report on a monthly basis what their bacteria levels are, but that is self-reported. TCEQ inspections are announced. Compliance inspections are typically announced 7-14 days.

S. It has been my experience when dealing with state and federal agencies... the more data that you can gather on your own to provide to them. The better the quality will be because a lot of those are either financial 'we don't have the manpower to do this,' if you can find a way to gather more data you are going to be a whole lot better off.

S. Can you talk about the process you are trying to set up now? Something with stakeholders, committees and different things; could you give an outline on time frame?

W. I think that would happen no matter which direction you decided to go. Based on experience it usually helps to get all the ranchers in a room and let's talk about what they can do; what is feasible and reasonable and develop a plan for them. For the septic systems and those type of issues, it is usually a good idea to get people from the county health departments and the TCEQ; get those guys and the communities dealing with those issues in a room; let them talk about the issues to figure out the best solution to that. Take the WWTPs people; get them in a room to come up with a plan. Instead of having

WWTP people try to figure out what a rancher needs to do and vice versa, get each workgroup to figure out what needs to be done in its own day to day operations. Then they bring their recommendations back to the stakeholder committee and say these are the things that are doable. That would happen no matter which decision ya'll wanted to go with...it's the best way to make a plan to move forward.

S. Could you give the stakeholders information on data collection and the types of pollutants so that we would know what we are talking about?

W. Yeah, we planned on doing that at a future meeting because we didn't want to overload ya'll. There has been a lot done. This watershed has been modeled twice. There has been a three to four year effort to collect a lot of additional data for this watershed. There are about twelve sites ya'll, the Nueces River Authority, collected data from at least once a month. They collected all those samples from the WWTPs in the watershed once a month for almost three years now. Then you got just the normal quarterly monitoring the state does. There is a lot of data that has been collected in this watershed and we didn't want to overload ya, but we can certainly do that for ya.

S. Can you elaborate on the twelve WWTPs in the watershed...it seems like there should be more.

W. I can read what's on the list...City of Sinton, City of Beeville, Chase field which is apparently city of Beeville...

S. Are those all discharges into the creek or...

A. These are all discharges into the creek or bay.

S. Directly into the creek or eventually into the creek?

A. Yes

S. Yes what!

A. Yes, some are eventually into the Aransas or Mission River and some are actually tributaries into the river.

S. But they are actually going into the water body?

A. Correct, we didn't do any of the ones that are for irrigation or evaporation.

S. Have ya'll done anything about the high offenders? If you have constant high offenders, you gotta do something about their wastewater.

A. A part of our group is called the small business local government subsistence group, upstairs in our Austin office and they actually have a team together that are going out and visiting the offenders; looking at their practices and seeing how they can make improvements in their system so they can comply with the discharge regulations.

B. That is something also that a TMDL would address.

S. Is this out of region 14 or is this out of Austin?

A. This is out of our central office.

S. So region 14 in Corpus is out of the loop on this one?

A. Well our compliance investigation that we do at a routine basis out there we are not collecting samples. I'm not sure what their processes is right now, they're just looking at how their system operates.

S. whenever you are looking at those WWTPs being in violation, are they in violation of their permit or are they in violation of a different set of standards?

W. I didn't say violation; I said the geometric mean exceeds the *E. coli* standard for 126.

A. A lot of those plants permits are 10-15, 10 BOD 15 TSS with no permit for the *E.coli*.

W. Right. That would come out of the TMDL. Currently that is the case statewide. In these TMDL watersheds, *E. coli* is being added to the permit process.

S. Allen, on your Plum Creek plan, was that all agriculture or what was that?

B. Aaron can help me, but it is a very urbanizing watershed...

A. That was both. It was the I35 corridor in Buda Kyle area. But mainly rural Caldwell County.

S. But those levels did drop?

A. It must have, to be taken off the list, but I will go and find out.

S. Does that state have enough resources to do anymore sampling, the financial resources?

W. I would guess probably not a great deal more. It took a special grant from the EPA through the soil and water conservation board to pay for all this additional monitoring and that has wrapped up. Ya'll know how federal state budgets are right now and this is one of, I think, 1,800 impairments on the 303(d) list. So the state is dealing with over 1,000 of these right now so they don't have resources.

S. What happens if we do nothing? We don't accept anything, nothing changes.

B. Chesapeake Bay is a fair example for that right now. There are stocking rates regulated per acre and...

S. Is that what phase is? In your slide you said phase TMDL...

W. No, a phase TMDL would be one where the first phase would not achieve water quality standards. We would say we can only get so far on Phase one, we can only get a 20% reduction and we need a 50% reduction. Then you need to start Phase two. I don't know if we being TCEQ or EPA or State would know what to do...but there is supposedly an option out there.

S. What if the Stakeholders wanted to do sampling on their own?

W. There are some very strict requirements on ensuring that the quality of that data is of the highest quality, even though Dr. Matthews certainly made some very valid points, they do have some high stipulations and volunteers monitoring would not be considered a high enough quality.

A. And we have found that the state is begging to accept those because they don't have the manpower to go out and do it. They are begging to bend, to accept it, and I am mainly referring to ground water levels in the ground water districts. Keep that in mind.

S. Where can we get a copy of their requirements for sampling? Say I wanted to go sample a creek, where do I send it to?

W. Two things..

A. I would say if a citizen, a land owner, wanted to do their own monitoring, they should talk to Texas Stream Team which is put on by Texas State at San Marcos because they provide training for volunteer monitoring, they can provide training on those issues of quality assurance. They can provide equipment so that land owners can do that kind of monitoring.

W. But that data could still not be used in the TMDL.

A. Not necessarily, if the stakeholders view the QAQC data is good enough, there is no reason that they couldn't use that data.

B. Do you have an example of that being done?

A. That is what I am saying, the stream team does bacteria monitoring. They do different methods than the professional labs do...it's just if the stakeholders in that watershed group are satisfied.

S. It's kinda along the same lines; I'm an Aransas county commissioner also with the oyster and shrimp business, a number of years ago when we unloaded shrimp, the EPA required that when we got done unloading we couldn't dump the water that was in our tanks into the bay without setting up a monitoring program even though the water going back in was as fresh as the other water we had this requirement. We hired some people from UT at Port Aransas to come and do the sampling and after about five or six years of testing they basically said there was nothing wrong with it. There are some groups like that where you can do some monitoring, if you do it yourself they are probably not going to believe what you say.

A. Not only that, if you take a sample in and it happens to be wrong, you can't say 'oh, lets take that back,' once that sample is in it's in for eternity. Most of the labs around here, there is a lab in Victoria and Corpus that do a lot of water sampling, they will give you a list of guidelines. There are a whole bunch of them.

A. Well Randy, you and I both came from Soil and Water Board years ago and there are EPA guidelines on how to take a sample and then there is a chain of command on how this is passed along. I know those labs in Corpus, but folks we are talking about thousands of dollars per sample to do this so unless you've got someone willing to back... King Ranch spent two million or four million, Leroy help me out on this, back when we first started the National Estuary program, just to take samples for two years.

A. They were looking at a lot of paramaters and bacteria samples are...

B. About \$50 a sample.

A. Who is accredited in this area? I know A&M Corpus Christi is but to a point.

A. No, they are gone now.

A. Well there you go...if you want criteria, go to the EPA website, the document 1600 gives you the criteria for samples and what you are supposed to do. Which is where I got my little speel from a little bit ago, off the EPA website. They have all the conditions that must be met for a proper sample to be met, then you'll understand just how difficult it is. You can't just go out when convenient. In all fairness to the EPA we gave them bad data. It went to TCEQ and then EPA and now we're on the list. We need to really look at how we sample, particularly out in the bay. In a stream you gotta know whether the water is running or stagnant and it's complicated. That's why you need a professional to do it to meet the criteria and even then you can't do it on a regular basis. It's our own fault really that we are on the list.

B. 1600 is for *Enterococci*, 1603 is for *E. coli*.

S. Could you go over that list again?

W. Yes, Sinton, Beeville, Chasefield, Odem, Refugio, Taft, Pettis, Bayside, Skidmore, St. Paul, (+two others)...those are the dischargers that were monitored.

S. Jack said there was another going in that wasn't monitored at Port Bay. I'd be curious, Campbell Slough drains all the way up to between Ingleside and Gregory and I don't know where they are.

A. Those all go to Corpus Christi Bay, you have to remember this is Copano Bay, Aransas River Mission River...not Aransas Bay.

S. If you are talking about Campbell bay it drains

A. North, North

S. You have San Patricio ditch that comes from Taft that goes into Copano Bay.

A. But what you were asking is about WWTPs, and those are all going into Nueces Bay.

B. We are going to have to revisit this...

S. It's unfair to say that only inflows from the Aransas and Mission Rivers affect Copano Bay.

B. It's not that we are avoiding those other drainages, it's just that the Aransas and Mission Rivers are impaired also...that's why they are the priority. Just like EPA focuses on the 303(d) list, we focus on the impaired waterbodies. If we can get these waterbodies off the 303(d) list, we will be out of EPA's focus.

B. To set the next meeting, do you prefer Tuesdays, Wednesdays, or Thursdays? Tuesdays, ok. Is this location ok? ok we will have it here again.

End.