

EARIP Meeting Notes

Location: SAWS Headquarters, San Antonio, Texas

Date: May 10, 2007

Time: 10am-2:00pm

Notetaker: Jodi Minion

10:00 Welcome and introduction: Patrick Shriver (SAWS), Tarla Rai Peterson (TAMU)

10:10—Allen Richmond (HQAETC/ Randolph AFB): Randolph AFB role and interest in EA RIP Process

DOD participation, action officer for water issues as part of military working group. Needs a one-on-one relationship with USFWS, drafting new biological opinion. Over past 5-years, there have been considerable conservation efforts in all three Air Force Bases. Participation in RIP- prefer observer status.

Questions

10:45—Anna Munoz: Barriers to Collaboration in existing RIPS. Governance issues crop up as challenges in various ways, depending on the specific group. Program manager is very important.

Questions.

11:30— Discussion regarding current Edwards Aquifer Legislation as it relates to the EA RIP. How will the RIP process be impacted by the state legislative process?

Joy Nicholopoulos (USFWS) What has role of the USFWS been?

“we were not invited and we do not comment on state Legislation. However, we do provide technical input when necessary.”

Concerns:

Is the RIP bound by TX legislation?

Specific Legal response: Fed agencies are not bound by TX legislation. State agencies are bound by TX legislation. Unclear how larger group is impacted by TX legislation.

Legislation poses problem for a RIP: RIP must be voluntary and inclusive. Legislation mandates participation by some and may exclude others.

Three entities (EEA, SAWS, GBRA) are listed in current version. Would these groups be able to influence the legislation toward more voluntary, inclusive approach?

Can this group move forward most effectively (work within the boundaries established by the legislation, and also bring in the voluntary and inclusive dimensions required for a RIP)?

12:15-12:45—lunch break

12:45-1:30—Discussion about ongoing legislation and its potential impact on the RIP.

Concerns expressed:

Steering committee membership is mandated and exclusionary.

Would be beneficial for legislation to give some leeway for developing the RIP process.

Decision making process may be a problem. Do we use simple majority vote, 2/3 majority, consensus, etc?

This legislation jeopardizes the credibility of the process.

Many of us may decide this is a waste of time.

A sign of good legislation is that no one is happy with it

Is this legislation just the beginning of a lawsuit?

RIP process should continue (but in different way) whether or not legislation passes.

1:30—Mary Kelly, legal issues associated with signing an MOA, suggestions for streamlining group process.

---

1:40—Schedule next few meetings, announcements, wrap up.

Set Location and Dates for future meetings:

Should we meet more often?

Continue monthly for now.

For convenience of travelers, meetings will be held 10am-2pm

Should we always meet in one place, or move around the Aquifer region

Senator Hagar would like to host a meeting in capitol building committee room (Austin)

GBRA, SAWS, City of San Marcos are happy to host meetings.

Next meetings set for:

June 7<sup>th</sup>—San Marcos Activities Center

July 12<sup>th</sup>—Austin, Capital

August 9<sup>th</sup>--New Braunfels, GBRA

September 6<sup>th</sup>—San Antonio, SAWS

2:00—Adjourn