

Alternative Management Measures Analysis: Stakeholder Comments As collected from stakeholder meetings held 6/23/2009, 7/21/2009, and 8/18/2009

General Comments

- Evaluation Criteria
 - Comment: Include Long term sustainability
 - Response: Incorporated into life cycle costs
 - Comment: Evaluation criteria wording “Watershed % Reduction” not appropriate
 - Resolution: Change to “Bacteria % Reduction”
 - Comment: Can we determine what % reduction in each subdivision needs to be reached to meet stakeholder goals?
 - Response: Recognize significant constraints to this approach, bacteria are living organism with complex life cycles – difficult to predict accurate reductions in concentrations at specific locations
- Weighting of evaluation criteria
 - All draft materials assume equal weighting for
 - Bacteria % reduction
 - Time to implementation
 - Cost index
 - No specific suggestions received to date
 - With regards to weighting and establishing evaluation criteria someone proposed providing a ratio of % reduction to the cost of the measure. General consensus was that the bacteria reduction is the most important factor. Others stated that cost would be important as well.
- Suggestion:
 - Prioritize areas and alternatives for implementation planning and funding outreach
 - Suggested we should only look at alternatives evaluation by subdivision and not comparatively to other subdivisions.
- Septic Inspections
 - Comment: Hood County Health Dept. has limited staffing resources to perform detailed inspections for all subdivisions.
 - Only superficial inspections, snapshot in time
 - Need to investigate enforcement of real estate inspections
- Life Span for Replacement of Septic Systems
 - Assumption: 25 yrs
 - Comments: 12 to 20 yrs to longer
 - Resolution: 20 years
- Terminology for Onsite Systems
 - Comments: Consistency between OWTS vs OSSF
 - Resolution: OSSF
- Power for wastewater collection systems
 - Assumption: 3-phase
 - Comments: May be optimistic for some areas.

- Response: Based upon contacts, 3-phs power appears available in relevant areas.
 - Assumption: Cost \$0.11/kWh
 - Comment: Recently increased by 8%
 - Resolution: Continue with current assumption unless otherwise resolved.
- Time to Implement wastewater collections systems
 - Comment: Is time to implementation the same for all subdivisions?
 - Resolution: Reduce for Port Ridglea East and Nassau Bay II considering plans already underway.
- Number of connections for collection system planning
 - Assumption: Equals the number of lots based on subdivision parcels
 - Comments: Some subdivisions have residences with double lots
 - Response: Determine appropriate ratio for each subdivision based on stakeholder input
- Cove Dynamics and Circulation
 - Structures in coves and canals may constrain navigability
 - Some of the water is too shallow to implement circulation features
- Package Plants
 - The representative from BRCC commented that generally in the area there is resistance to package plants and efforts should emphasis away from small package plants because of a need for strong supervision. Alva Cox commented that the local facilities can go “belly-up” fast and need the ability to address problems fast. Need to consider who would manage these and how capable would they be to quickly handle a problem.
- Educational Programs
 - Ned Meister with the TX Farm Bureau noted that their agency has put together a website for information for small acreage land owners.
 - There are a lot of people who purchase these larger lots but do not know much about management.
 - He noted that Dr. Allan Jones, Texas AgriLife Research and Extension Urban Solutions Center at Dallas, has developed a model for small farm management programs.
 - Mitch Conine with TSSWCB has commented on the availability of the soil board to work with individuals for water quality management plans through the EQIP programs.
 - Bill O’Quinn with NRCS explained services for individuals to develop site specific management plans – developing costs is difficult since it would be case dependent management measures. The agency does work with individuals to develop cost sharing.
 - Clint Wolfe with Texas AgriLife Extension provided a list of available programs and costs. These are mostly educational courses and workshops that would be open to the public – ie lake wide measures.
 - Information for developing bacteria reduction effectiveness is not available. Need to look at how other WPPs incorporated education into their plans.

Comments by Area

- **Rolling Hills Shores**
 - Possible Alternative Investigation
 - Terrace or catchment for upper watershed
- **Oak Trail Shores**
 - Alternatives to Investigate
 - Flush water through cove from offsite drainage
 - Flush more water through cove from pumping
 - Number of Connections
 - Assumption: # of lots
 - Comment: Some are double lots
 - Response: Use number of parcels because of potential for future redevelopment

OTS representative stated that filling the canal is not realistic and would only be moving the problem. His comments could be summarized in three points:

1. Are we going to look at greywater? Response: Lake wide septic education, can include as focus for OTS.
2. Filling of canals would not be acceptable to residents/community
3. Treating the source is the ideal solution rather than diluting by improved circulation patterns.

- **Long Creek**
 - Alternatives to Investigate
 - Watershed Management above monitoring point
 - Education should be top of priorities
 - Regional wastewater collection low priority because of remote location
 - Other Comments:
 - 200-500 geese can be seen on the turf grass fields.
 - Septic systems are not a problem in this area
 - Slide 4 100% reduction refers to human sources in subdivision
 - Investigate septic pump-out and land application near Hwy 51.
 - Investigate turfgrass farm
 - use of compost/organic fertilizer?
 - Suggested that the Brazos Coalition sample at the creek outlet for comparison to current station.
- **Sky Harbor**
 - Cove dynamics dredging option:
 - Assumption: 5 years until re-dredging
 - Comments: 5' sediment accumulation in 30 years
 - Proposed Resolution: 15 years to re-dredging (evaluate other subdivisions case-by-case)
 - Number of connections
 - Assumption: Number of connections = # lots

- Comment: Many residences use double lots
 - Response: Assume connections for 75% of lots
- **Indian Harbor**
 - AMUD suggests it would be best to serve the entire subdivision plus surrounding communities.
 - Also sizing the collection system based on the number of parcels would be consistent with typical planning, given existing lot sizes.
- **Nassau Bay II**
 - Richard English (AMUD) stated that a package facility is not feasible in this subdivision because of siting constraints.
- **Port Ridglea East**
 - use of theoretical 100% reduction of bacteria deceiving, report as 99%
- **Waters Edge**
 - No comments to date.
- **Blue Water Shores**
 - No stakeholder comments were made.
 - Tiffany suggested this may be a lower priority area.
 - Main concern for this area for pet waste because of the proximity of homes to canals and the amount of impervious cover.
 - Address with pet waste education
- **Walnut Creek**
 - Watershed Education Programs would be beneficial in this area.