

# Stakeholder Organizational Framework and Decision Making Processes

*Clare Entwistle*

*Texas Water Resources Institute*

*May 18, 2017*



# Goals of the Plan



- Address impairments in Mid and Lower Cibolo Creek (De-listed from 303d List)
- Dependent upon stakeholder support and participation

# Reason for Structure and Importance of Decisions

- ⦿ To gain as much input and support from the local stakeholders as possible and allow them to make decisions that benefit everyone within the watershed
- ⦿ Decision making process is critical to the development of the Watershed-Based Plan
- ⦿ Mechanisms used affect the efficiency of the process

# Keys to developing successful strategies

- ⊙ Involvement of a diversity of interests
- ⊙ Collaborative decision-making
  - ⊙ Joint goals and priorities for partnership initiatives
- ⊙ Decision-making based on sound science and accurate information
- ⊙ Strong communication and outreach
- ⊙ Short-term doable action items and long-term objectives/goals

# What is a Stakeholder

- ⦿ A group or individual who:
  - ⦿ *Has the responsibility for implementing a decision*
  - ⦿ *Is affected by the decision*
  - ⦿ *Assists with problem identification*
  - ⦿ *Promotes awareness, education, and action*
  - ⦿ *Facilitates implementation of solutions*

# Types of Stakeholders

*Stakeholders can belong to the following entities:*

- ⊙ Landowners
- ⊙ County or regional representatives
- ⊙ Local municipal representatives
- ⊙ State and federal agencies
- ⊙ Business and industry representatives
- ⊙ Citizen groups
- ⊙ Community service and Religious organizations
- ⊙ Universities, colleges, and schools
- ⊙ Environmental and conservation groups
- ⊙ Soil and water conservation districts

# Major Tasks for Stakeholders

- ⦿ Provide guidance and input on potential sources of bacteria and nutrients and estimated pollutant loads
- ⦿ Set goals and objectives
- ⦿ Guide identification of measures that could be implemented to address bacteria
- ⦿ Identify outreach and education that is needed
- ⦿ Oversee development of an implementation plan & schedule

# Goals for today

- ⦿ Initiate discussions on how best to organize stakeholders to maximize local input
  - ⦿ Main Entities to include
  - ⦿ Discuss Structure of Stakeholder Group



# Stakeholder Group Framework



# Level of Participation

- ⊙ Coordination/Steering Committee – A decision making body made up of stakeholders from diverse interest/backgrounds

*Meetings once a month between WG and Committee*

- ⊙ Stakeholder Group – The general body of individuals who participate in public meetings

- ⊙ Workgroup – Groups made up of stakeholders of a similar interest/background

*Meetings once a month between WG and Committee Meetings*

- ⊙ Technical Advisory Group – Consisting of state and federal agencies with water quality responsibilities.

*1-2 Additional meetings; participate in WG and Committee*

Meetings

# Coordination Committee Overview

## Coordination Committee:

- ⦿ Formed from a core group of watershed stakeholders
- ⦿ Goal is to be equally representative of watershed stakeholders in the review of the Watershed Protection Plan
- ⦿ Facilitates active coordination amongst stakeholder interest groups:
  - ⦿ Identify desired WQ condition and measurable goals
  - ⦿ Prioritize programs and practices to achieve those goals
  - ⦿ Assist in the development of the watershed protection plan development
  - ⦿ Lead implementation of the plan at the local level
  - ⦿ Communicate with interested parties in the watershed about the plan

# Possible Committee Members – If Needed

Mid and Lower Cibolo Watershed Counties: Guadalupe, Bexar, Wilson, Karnes

- ⊙ Citizen
- ⊙ County Extension Agents
- ⊙ Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- ⊙ County Judge or Commissioner
- ⊙ San Antonio River Authority
- ⊙ USDA- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- ⊙ Randolph AFB
- ⊙ City of Schertz, La Vernia, Stockdale, Marion, Universal City
- ⊙ Landowners
- ⊙ County Health Inspector
- ⊙ Subdivision or homeowner's association
- ⊙ Local Groundwater Conservation Districts
- ⊙ Local Industry
- ⊙ Wastewater Treatment Plants
- ⊙ City Public Works Department/Urban Planning Departments
- ⊙ Others

# Coordination Committee Suggestions

- ⦿ Are there any critical groups that we need to include in the process?
- ⦿ Groups listed that should be removed?
- ⦿ Any specific person(s) that should be included to better represent the listed groups?
- ⦿ Committee name?
- ⦿ Other Ideas or Discussion?

# Work Group Roles

- ⦿ Responsible for assisting with the WPP development, review, determining progress, and coming up with recommended implementation strategies to include in the WPP
- ⦿ Each work group will only focus on work group specific issues
  - ⦿ Example: Natural Resources group focuses on solutions to agriculture, habitat and wildlife related *E. coli* loading
- ⦿ Work with project facilitator to draft ideas into work group specific report

# Possible Work Groups

## Topics to consider for Cibolo Creek:

- ◉ Agricultural Issues
- ◉ Coordination and Policy
- ◉ Education and Outreach
- ◉ Habitat/Wildlife
- ◉ On-Site Sewage/OSSF
- ◉ Ordinance and Planning
- ◉ Natural Resource Management
- ◉ Science and Monitoring
- ◉ Urban Storm Water
- ◉ Wastewater Infrastructure

## Suggested Work Groups:

- ◉ Urban
- ◉ Agricultural
- ◉ Wastewater

# Suggested Work Group Structure

- ⦿ Members should provide adequate representation from needed parties
- ⦿ Have at least 1 work group member serve on Coordination Committee
  - ⦿ Liaison to Coordination Committee that provides work group updates
- ⦿ Adhere to same ground rules as Coordination Committee



# Technical Advisory Guidance Committee

## ◎ Possible TAG members:

- ◎ Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board
- ◎ Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
- ◎ Texas Parks & Wildlife Department
- ◎ Texas A&M Forest Service
- ◎ Texas Department of Agriculture
- ◎ Texas Railroad Commission
- ◎ TxDOT
- ◎ Texas Farm Bureau

- ◎ Responsible for providing guidance to the Steering Committee and work groups, and answers questions related to matters falling under the jurisdiction of each TAG member.

# Decision Making Processes



# Importance of Decisions

- ⊙ Decision making process is critical to the development of the WPP
- ⊙ Mechanisms used effect the efficiency of the process
- ⊙ Number of decision makers can have a significant influence
- ⊙ Decision making process dictates what is included in the Watershed Protection Plan

# Possible Decision Making Processes

## ⊙ Formal

- ⊙ Established bylaws that govern the actions of the committee
- ⊙ Adhere to Open Meeting Act Requirements
- ⊙ Formal voting of Coordination Committee

## ⊙ Informal

- ⊙ Develop a set of ground rules that will be used to govern the committee
- ⊙ Committee members approve ground rules and their use
- ⊙ Voting by consensus/majority rules

# Ground Rules Examples

## ⦿ Geronimo Creek – More Formal

- ⦿ Goals
- ⦿ Powers
- ⦿ Timeframe
- ⦿ Membership Selection
- ⦿ Steering Committee
- ⦿ Workgroup
- ⦿ Technical advisory
- ⦿ Replacement/additions
- ⦿ Alternates
- ⦿ Decision making
- ⦿ Quorum
- ⦿ Facilitators

## ⦿ Upper Gulf Coast Oyster Waters – Less Formal

- ⦿ No formal voting committee/representative
- ⦿ Speak up
- ⦿ Disagree respectfully
- ⦿ Silence is presumed consent
- ⦿ Listen during discussions
- ⦿ Respect opinions and don't criticize people
- ⦿ Be open to new ideas
- ⦿ Silence cell phones
- ⦿ Have fun

# Cibolo Creek Coordination Committee will determine the Method of Governance

- ⦿ The Steering Committee formed for Cibolo Creek will vote to determine if they would like to move forward with more or less formal ground rules and voting methods.
  - ⦿ Consensus
  - ⦿ Quorum
  - ⦿ Majority

# Next Steps and Timeline

*Clare Entwistle*

*Research Associate*

*Texas Water Resources Institute*



# Next Steps – Near Term

- ⦿ Continue building partnerships
- ⦿ Work on characterizing the watershed (TWRI)
- ⦿ Water Quality Monitoring (SARA)
- ⦿ Presentations will be uploaded to project website:  
[Cibolo.tamu.edu](http://Cibolo.tamu.edu)





# Next Meeting

- ⦿ Alternating location or find middle ground?
  - ⦿ Date will be announced after looking at evaluation and determining best time for the majority of people
  
- ⦿ Topics:
  - ⦿ Recap meeting 1 – quick review of materials
  - ⦿ Finalize watershed partnership
  - ⦿ Discuss example watershed-based plan
  - ⦿ Discuss additional information collected on Mid and Lower Cibolo Creek

# Overall Timeline

- ⦿ May 2017 – August 2018: Stakeholder and topical work group meetings to assist plan development– Meetings once a month alternating between topical work groups and general stakeholder meetings
- ⦿ April/May 2018: Submit draft watershed-based plan to TSSWCB for review
- ⦿ August 2018: Final watershed-plan submitted to TSSWCB and sent to EPA for review.
- ⦿ Summer 2018: Apply for 319 funding to begin implementation in FY 2019

## Questions/Discussion

Clare Entwistle

Texas Water Resources Institute

[Clare.Entwistle@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:Clare.Entwistle@ag.tamu.edu)

210-277-0292 ext 110

Lucas Gregory, PhD

Texas Water Resources Institute

[lfgregory@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:lfgregory@ag.tamu.edu)

Nikki Dictson

Texas Water Resources Institute

[ndictson@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:ndictson@ag.tamu.edu)

Michael Schramm

Texas Water Resources Institute

[Michael.Schramm@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:Michael.Schramm@ag.tamu.edu)

**Project Website: [Cibolo.tamu.edu](http://Cibolo.tamu.edu)**