

Colorado-Lavaca Basin and Bay Expert Science Team
February 15, 2011 8:30am
Action Items and Consensus Decision Points

The Colorado-Lavaca BBEST met on February 15th at LCRA in Austin. Okla Thornton and Joe Trungale were unable to attend.

Consensus Decision: December 21, 2010 and January 18-19, 2011 Consensus Points and Action Items

Because two members were absent, the group agreed to postpone adoption of the consensus decision points and action items from the December 21, 2010 meeting and review of the consensus decision points and action items from the January 18-19, 2011 meetings.

Discussion, Consensus Decisions, and Action Items: Review of Draft BBEST Report

The group reviewed and addressed electronic comments and questions in the draft report from the Texas Water Resources Institute (TWRI). The comments and questions generally dealt with issues of style and format. [Action Item] – Richard Hoffpauir will consult with TWRI regarding the readability of the hydrographs under the stream gage descriptions.

The BBEST next went through a bulleted list of questions and comments from the meeting agenda related to various editorial aspects of the draft report. Action Item – All section/subsection authors need to provide a list of acronyms used in their portions of the report and their definitions to Dave Buzan and Richard Hoffpauir by Thursday, February 17th. It was mentioned that TWRI will be providing the next draft of the report on February 25th. Any edits after that time will be made by TWRI. [Action Item] – Thom Hardy asked that any more edits to his sections in chapter 3 be provided to him by noon tomorrow (February 16th). [Consensus Decision] – The group decided that an example of the water quality analyses will be given in the report appendices, but the rest of the analyses will be posted on the BBEST page on TCEQ's website. They also decided that TWDB's coastal hydrology and TXBLEND documentation would be placed on TCEQ's website and only referenced in the report.

Dave referred to a draft title page and executive summary that was previously distributed to the group. [Action Item] - Comments on this are due by tomorrow (February 16th). The group then discussed the overall layout and format of the major sections of the draft report. [Action Item] – Gregg Easley (TCEQ) will check with Kathy Alexander (TCEQ) about changing Tres Palacios River to Tres Palacios Creek on the maps TCEQ provided for the report. Dave went through the detailed summary layout and reiterated the general changes and insertions that were discussed earlier.

The group discussed Section 3 of the draft report. It was mentioned that Joe Trungale will be writing up the subsection on hydrologic conditions. Review of his work will be handled by e-mail. Dave encouraged authors to highlight important points at the beginning of their subsections, much like he did for Nolan Raphelt's (TWDB)

geomorphology subsection. The group then engaged in a more in-depth discussion on the subject of geomorphology and what can be distilled from the analytical results of this overlay. [Consensus Decision] – The group agreed on channel maintenance flow language that incorporates the range of flows concluded from the analysis of three sites that maintains existing channel morphology (77-93% of average annual flow) and that identifies the need for site-specific studies to more precisely quantify these channel maintenance flows. This statement will be included in all flow regime recommendation tables, except for the three lower Colorado River sites (Bastrop, Columbus, and Wharton). [Consensus Decision] – For these three sites, the channel maintenance recommendation from the LSWP study will be retained, though a qualifying statement will be added noting that the BBEST and LSWP geomorphic analyses were different.

Kirk Kennedy discussed progress on his section on the preliminary WAM evaluation of the instream recommendations and items he still needs to incorporate. The group also discussed attainment frequencies and hydrologic conditions. HEFR tables will contain historic frequencies of the flow numbers, but they are not being recommended as actual attainment frequencies. It was suggested that the BBEST should recommend frequencies of achievement that maintain a sound ecological environment. The instream versus inflow recommendations comparison conducted by Richard Hoffpauir was done based on instream target frequencies of 5% subsistence, 20% low base, 50% average base, and 25% high base. [Consensus Decision] – The group agreed to recommend the 5%/20%/50%/25% approach as engagement or application frequencies. This will be added to the recommended flow regime tables, including a brief explanation of what the frequencies represent. Implementation of this in the form of hydrologic conditions or some other approach can take place with the BBASC after the report is finalized. [Action Item] – Richard Hoffpauir will draft a more detailed paragraph explaining the engagement frequencies for incorporation into the preliminary implementation section of the report. A discussion ensued regarding whether Kirk's WAM evaluation needs to be included in the report, whether it's misleading or an inappropriate way to analyze the recommendations, or whether it's an important first step in the evaluation process that can be further developed with the BBASC. [Consensus Decision] - It was suggested and all agreed that only the base flow tables, presented in a more simplified fashion, should be presented in the report along with an explanation of why the pulse flow analyses are not being included (i.e., computational issues).

Lastly, the group discussed Thom Hardy's draft paragraph in the preamble which explains why HEFR-derived flow values at non-LSWP sites were not modified based on the technical overlays. [Action Item] – Dave will work on the language, incorporating it into the initial roadmap section at the front of the report, and e-mail it to the group for their feedback.