

Conceptual Plan for Public Use

On

**City of Austin
Water & Wastewater Utility**

Water Quality Protection Lands (WQPL)

Submitted to:

**City of Austin Water & Wastewater Commission
for review and recommendation
to the Austin City Council**

Submitted by:

**WQPL Stakeholder Steering Committee
May 18, 2001**

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 0.0 Executive Summary | 2 |
| 1.0 The Process | 3 |
| 1.1 The Purchase of Water Quality Protection Lands..... | 3 |
| 1.2 The Public Input Process..... | 3 |
| 1.2.1 Survey to Assess Desires for Public Access on WQPL..... | 3 |
| 1.2.2 Public Information Meeting..... | 4 |
| 1.2.3 Formation of the Stakeholder Steering Committee..... | 4 |
| 1.2.4 The Approval Process for Recommendations..... | 5 |
| 1.2.5 The Stakeholder Steering Committee Participants..... | 5 |
| 1.2.6 Definition of Consensus and Stakeholder Steering Committee Guidelines.. | 5 |
| 1.2.7 Constraints and Parameters..... | 6 |
| 1.2.8 Guiding Principles..... | 6 |
| 2.0 Recommendations | 7 |
| 2.1 Recommended Public Use | 9 |
| 2.1.1 Education..... | 9 |
| 2.1.2 Hiking..... | 9 |
| 2.1.3 Horse Riding..... | 9 |
| 2.1.4 Hunting..... | 9 |
| 2.1.5 Mountain Biking..... | 9 |
| 2.1.6 Organized Sports..... | 10 |
| 2.2 Conditionally Recommended Public Use | 10 |
| 2.2.1 Hiking..... | 10 |
| 2.2.2 Mountain Biking..... | 10 |
| 2.2.3 Horse Riding..... | 10 |
| 2.3 Additional Consensus Recommendations | 10 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|---|
| 2.0 Stakeholder Steering Committee Consensus Recommendations for Public Access..... | 8 |
|--|---|

Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Stakeholder Criteria & Characteristics..... | 11 |
| B. Stakeholder Steering Committee Consensus Process Agreement..... | 12 |
| C. Proposal by Austin Ridge Riders..... | 16 |
| D. Proposal by Austin Woods and Waters..... | 18 |
| E. Proposal by Bull Creek Foundation..... | 20 |

0.0 Executive Summary

As a result of two utility bonds authorized in 1998, the City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility became the proud owner of approximately 7,000 acres of land in Travis and Hays Counties and bought the development rights to another 7,800 acres for the purpose of preserving and enhancing water quality and quantity. These lands have become known as the Water Quality Protection Lands (WQPL).

This report explains the public participation process that was designed to ensure that local organizations and individuals would have a voice in determining public use of this land, as well as delineating the consensus-based recommendations from the Stakeholder Steering Committee, a group of 21 stakeholder organizations. After a public meeting was conducted to solicit opinions from citizens, the Stakeholder Steering Committee was convened by the Water and Wastewater Utility to make recommendations to City Council regarding public use on WQPL. After 12 meetings, the Steering Committee reached consensus on recommended uses. Its recommendations are contained in this report and a brief summary is listed below.

The Stakeholder Steering Committee recommends that the following activities can be planned, designed and implemented during the first seven-year WQPL treatment cycle (2001-2007):

- Educational activities be associated with each WQPL watershed.
- Multi-use trails for hiking and mountain biking be created in the Upper Barton and Bull Creek Watersheds.
- A multi-use trail for hiking, biking and horse riding be created in the Slaughter Creek Watershed.
- A trail for hiking be created in the Onion Creek Watershed.
- Hunting with primitive camping be allowed on the Lower Bear and Onion Creek Watersheds as a way to reduce deer, feral hog and black buck populations.

Similar activities were “conditionally recommended” on other watersheds. These can be reconsidered no later than the beginning of the Water and Wastewater Utility’s second seven-year WQPL land treatment cycle (2008-2014) contingent upon successful implementation of the recommended activities. These include trails for hiking and biking on Lower Bear and Lower Barton Watersheds and enhancement of the trail on Onion Creek to include horses and bikes.

“Not recommended” uses will be eligible for review and re-evaluation at the beginning of each seven-year WQPL land treatment cycle.

See Section 2.0 for further details about the recommendations.

1.0 The Process

1.1 The Purchase of Water Quality Protection Lands (WQPL)

In 1998, City of Austin voters approved two separate utility bonds: Proposition 2 in May, and Proposition 8 in November. Voter approval made it possible to purchase important watershed protection lands in southwestern Travis and adjacent northern Hays Counties. As of September 2000, Austin's Water and Wastewater Utility (the Utility) had purchased full title to 7,208 acres and conservation easements on 7,709 acres. After the sale of some tracts, the Utility expects to own full title to approximately 6,400 acres and conservation easements on approximately 8,500 acres.

Properties in which the Utility owns full title can be grouped into five watersheds along Bull (60 acres), Barton (1606 acres), Slaughter (646 acres), Bear (2352 acres) and Onion (1738 acres) Creeks. Two of the watersheds, Bear and Barton, have non-contiguous properties, and will be discussed as the "Upper" and "Lower" portions of their watersheds based on their North/South location. These lands have since become known as the Utility's Water Quality Protection Lands.

1.2 The Public Input Process

In September, 1999 the Utility hired the Land Management Planning Group (LMPG) to develop a land management plan including the consideration of public access for the WQPL to which the Utility owned full title. The LMPG is a consortium led by the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center. The public and stakeholder participation has been coordinated by Creating Common Ground as a member of the LMPG.

1.2.1 Survey to Assess Desires for Public Access on WQPL

In the initial proposal to the Utility, the LMPG had identified 46 groups that should be contacted concerning public access on the Water Quality Protection Lands. By December, 1999, LMPG had increased that list to over 100 and had begun to send out a survey to assess the desires for public access on WQPL. Additionally, the survey form was available upon request from the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center and on the Utility's web site (<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/water/prop2site.htm>). This website address was also featured in two newspaper articles. A full list of those contacted, the summary report of the stakeholder survey, and the full stakeholder responses are available as appendices to LMPG's final report.

LMPG received 55 survey responses from 42 different stakeholder organizations and 13 individuals. The leading interests and concerns expressed by those returning the surveys were:

- Preservation of habitat
- Public access and use
- Recreational trails
- Horseback riding
- Public education

The leading proposed uses were:

- Recreational trails
- Other passive uses
- Horseback riding

The leading “hopes, wishes or vision” were:

- Preservation of the land and its natural resources
--balanced with--
- Passive uses such as trails, horseback riding and education

Respondents were willing to make significant contributions of volunteer time and in some cases other resources, to the ongoing management and operation of the WQPL. Approximately 70% of those responding said they would contribute something. Over 90% of those responding were interested in participating in a public involvement process to determine the best use of the WQPL.

1.2.2 Public Information Meeting

In July 2000, citizens were invited to attend a Public Information Meeting held at the Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center to solicit additional public input. Advertising was accomplished through a notice and a quarter-page ad in the Austin American Statesman and by advertising on Channel 6. About 120 citizens attended the meeting, with 30 voicing their opinions about the uses they would like to see. Another 14 expressed their wishes on Citizen Input Forms, which were collected at the conclusion of the meeting. A variety of comments was heard, ranging from allowing no access because of the potential damage to the land, to allowing trails for hikers, bird watchers, equestrians, and bicyclists. Many spoke passionately and eloquently of “treading lightly” while still allowing public access.

1.2.3 Formation of the Stakeholder Steering Committee

Following the survey and the public meeting, LMPG invited all interested parties to participate in a facilitated stakeholder group that became the WQPL Stakeholder Steering Committee (SSC). The SSC was formed to recommend what public uses and activities would be allowed, where they would be allowed, and how the access would be funded and maintained. The qualifications for stakeholders were developed by the LMPG in consultation with Utility staff. Stakeholder qualifications are described in Appendix A.

In a separate contract the Utility hired Austin Group Specialists to facilitate the SSC meetings using a consensus-based decision-making process that has resulted in the recommendations contained in this Conceptual Plan.

These facilitated Stakeholder Steering Committee meetings began September 27, 2000, and have occurred approximately biweekly through the SSC’s last meeting of this initial planning phase on April 18, 2001. Recommendations of the Stakeholder Steering Committee are respectfully submitted to the Water & Wastewater Commission and ultimately the City Council for review and approval. It is the intention of Utility staff that the involvement of Stakeholders will continue into the next implementation phase.

1.2.4 The Approval Process for Recommendations

The LMPG and Utility staff agreed that the SSC recommendations for public access would be presented to the Water & Wastewater Commission for advisory approval, and then to City Council for final approval. This Conceptual Plan contains those recommendations for public use and activities made by the Stakeholder Steering Committee. As of the last SSC meeting on April 18, 2001 the Stakeholder Steering Committee unanimously supports the Conceptual Plan recommendations.

1.2.5 The Stakeholder Steering Committee Participants

This plan would not be possible without the active participation of the Stakeholder Steering Committee. The following citizens have (as representatives and alternates) participated in a consensus-based decision-making process representing their organizations:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Hill Abell, Tom Delaney | Austin Metro Trail and Greenways (AMTG) |
| Robert Schneider | Austin Neighborhoods Council (ANC) |
| Mark Zahn, Debbie Main | Austin Ridge Riders (ARR) |
| Karin Ascot | Austin Sierra Club (ASC) |
| Eric Hansen | Austin Woods and Waters Club (AWWC) |
| Craig Smith | Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District (BS/EACD) |
| Charlie McCabe, Skip Cameron | Bull Creek Foundation (BCF) |
| Willy Conrad, Joanna Hahm | COA-Water & Wastewater Utility (COA) |
| Chris North, John Sandford | Hays County Parks Board (HCPB) |
| George Cofer | Hill Country Conservancy (HCC) |
| Cathy Nordstrom, David Heberling | Native Plant Society of Texas (NPSOT) |
| Louise Morrell, Craig Smith | Save Barton Creek Association (SBCA) |
| Mary Gay Maxwell | Save Our Springs Alliance (SOSA) |
| Cindy Nettles, John Roop | Shady Hollow Homeowners Association (SHHOA) |
| Jerry Heaney, John Kuhl | South Austin Youth Soccer Association (SAYSA) |
| Julie Jenkins, Bill Russell | Texas Cave Management Association (TCMA) |
| Amy Marvin, Anne Taylor | Texas Equestrian Trail Riders Assn. (TETRA), Equestrian Land Conservation Resource (ELCR) |
| John Kelly | Travis Audubon Society (TAS) |
| Marcy Holloway, Jonathan Coker | Village of Bee Cave (VBC) |

1.2.6 Definition of Consensus and Stakeholder Steering Committee Guidelines

Through its first several meetings the SSC discussed the process by which it would attempt to come to agreement on its recommendations. With the skilled assistance of Austin Group Specialists, the SSC adopted the guidelines in Appendix B that established its decision-making process.

While all the guidelines were important to the success of the process, the definition of consensus was crucial. It is as follows:

“Use of Consensus. The Stakeholder Steering Committee will operate by consensus. Consensus is defined as each member agreeing to support an item. Committee decisions

will be made only with the concurrence of all members represented at that meeting. All members share responsibility for the process and the decisions. When consensus is close, but someone disagrees, the member who disagrees must state the reasons for their objection and state an idea for how their needs can be met.”

“Failure to Reach Consensus. If the Stakeholder Steering Committee cannot reach consensus on an item, the facilitators will record the various opinions expressed by the Committee and this information will be provided in full to the LMPG. The LMPG will consider this input, as well as input from the general public and other organizations, and will make the recommendations it believes are most appropriate. Committee members retain their right to comment positively or negatively about any item on which the group was unable to agree.”

1.2.7 Constraints and Parameters

The SSC also adopted the following list of Constraints and Parameters to use in developing recommendations for public use and activities on the Water Quality Protection Lands. They are as follows:

“The primary purpose of the decision-making process will be to help stakeholders plan public access and public activities on Water Quality Protection Lands. While this will not directly influence land treatment and land management, it may do so indirectly. This would occur by coordinating and scheduling management activities and public activities. Therefore:

1. Any plans resulting from this process must ensure that water quality and quantity functions on the land are protected or enhanced during all public activities on the land.
2. This is a planning process where stakeholders will collaborate to achieve consensus for any recommendation included in the plan. The city is also a stakeholder and will be included in the consensus.
3. The City Council is the final decision maker for these lands. Products from this process will go to the council as a recommendation. However, plans with broad consensus-based public involvement provide a solid basis for council consideration.
4. The Water and Wastewater Utility, which is funded by its rate structure, manages these lands. Any funds the utility spends come from ratepayers’ monthly bills. Furthermore, since the utility is not a parks or recreation organization, all facilities and accommodations for public access must be funded outside of the rate structure, including maintenance and upkeep. It will be the responsibility of the stakeholders to locate and acquire this funding.”

1.2.8 Guiding Principles

In addition and in keeping with the bond language and limitations in the conservation easement agreements, the following Guiding Principles were offered by Utility staff and used by the Stakeholder Steering Committee in considering public use and activity recommendations:

- No public access is granted or precluded as a part of any conservation easements and is entirely at the discretion of the landowner.
- Some level of public access will occur on Water Quality Protection Lands.

- Any access occurring on lands held in full fee should have their negative impacts mitigated, with the goal of having no net loss to water quality and quantity, and hopefully, a net gain to water quality and quantity.
- The WQPL cannot become parkland, in name or intent. They must primarily serve to enhance the City of Austin's water supply in perpetuity. All access occurring on WQPL must support this mission.
- The WQPL are owned and maintained by the City of Austin Water & Wastewater Utility, which received its funding from their customers. Providing funding for more than limited education-related access is beyond their mandate. Therefore, more intense public access must find methodologies for the development and maintenance of the activity from outside of the Water & Wastewater Utility.
- Only limited Water & Wastewater staff time is available to be used towards the oversight of development and maintenance activities as part of public access on WQPL.

These guiding principals were also adopted by the SSC. The Guiding Principals also led the Utility staff, LMPG, and Austin Group Specialists to develop the multi-layered process designed to assess the types of desired public access and to develop a public stakeholder base of support to help select, implement, and manage public access on Water Quality Protection Lands. The next section describes the resulting recommendations from this process.

2.0 Recommendations

The following are consensus recommendations of the Stakeholder Steering Committee. The LMPG has completed a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of each use or activity which is in the LMPG's Final Report. Please note that implementation of any proposed activity is contingent upon meeting all LMPG and Utility staff's concerns about potential impacts. See Table 2.0 for Consensus Recommendations for Public Use.

The following definitions were adopted by the SSC for *recommended*, *conditionally recommended* and *not recommended* public uses:

- **Recommended Uses** are those recommended to be planned, designed and implemented during the Water and Wastewater Utility's first seven-year Water Quality Protection Land treatment cycle (2001-07).
- **Conditionally Recommended Uses** are those conditionally recommended to be reconsidered no later than the beginning of the Water and Wastewater Utility's second seven-year WQPL land treatment cycle (2008-2014) contingent upon successful implementation of the recommended activities.
- **Not Recommended Uses** are those not recommended at this time. They will be eligible for review and re-evaluation at the beginning of each seven-year WQPL land treatment cycle.

**Table 2.0 Stakeholder Steering Committee Consensus
Recommendations for Public Use**

| UPPER BARTON | LOWER BARTON | UPPER BEAR | LOWER BEAR | BULL | ONION | SLAUGHTER |
|--|--|---------------------|--|--|---|---|
| RECOMMENDED: | | | | | | |
| Hiking (seasonal) | | | | Hiking | Hiking (short trail) | Hiking |
| Mountain Biking (seasonal) | | | | Mountain Biking | | Mountain Biking |
| | | | | | | Horse Riding |
| | | | Hunting (w/ primitive camping) | | Hunting (w/ primitive camping) | |
| Education | Education | Education | Education | Education | Education | Education |
| STAKEHOLDER GROUPS OFFERING RESOURCES:* | | | | | | |
| HCC TAS NPSOT COA ARR SOSA AWWC BCF AMTG | HCC NPSOT COA SOSA ARR TAS AWWC BCF AMTG | TCMA SOSA BCF | AWWC NPSOT COA SOSA ARR HCPB BCF TCMA AMTG | NPSOT ARR COA AWWC BCF AMTG | TETRA/ELCR HCC ARR NPSOT AWWC COA SOSA BSEACD HCPB AMTG TCMA BCF | NPSOT ARR HCC TETRA/ELCR COA SOSA AWWC AMTG BCF TCMA |
| CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED: | | | | | | |
| | Hiking | | Hiking | | | |
| | Mountain Biking | | Mountain Biking | | Mountain Biking | |
| | | | | | Horse Riding | |

*See section 1.2.5. for organization abbreviations.

2.1 Recommended Public Use

2.1.1 Education

The SSC recommends that educational activities be associated with each WQPL watershed. As part of this recommendation, the SSC recognizes and complements the Utility staff for initiating an Educational Task Force (ETF) and for developing a relationship with the Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District so that BS/EACD staff member Gail Garrettson can coordinate this effort. The purpose of the task force is to create an education plan for the Utility for WQPL. The goals are that the plan will provide guidance in their approach, will help prioritize tasks/steps, will identify collaborative/partnership opportunities, and will make specific suggestions for on- and off-site education activities.

The SSC also recommended that:

- All public uses that are recommended include an educational component.
- The educational component should be accessible in as low-impact a way as possible. Examples of such components are kiosks; interpretive signs along trails; and a loop trail at the entrance to a site that also accommodates mobility impaired users.
- “Off-site” educational efforts be encouraged, including use of the web.
- Educational activities should not include the building of any new classroom/educational buildings.

2.1.2 Hiking

Hiking trails are recommended in the Upper Barton, Bull, Onion and Slaughter Creek Watersheds. The Upper Barton Creek hiking trail recommendation is limited to use not to conflict with the breeding season of the Golden-cheeked Warbler. The Onion Creek hiking trail recommendation is limited to a short trail, to be defined further in the implementation phase. Trails should be constructed and maintained in the recommended watersheds where they are expected to have the least adverse impact and have the greatest potential for mitigation.

See the Bull Creek Foundation Proposal (Appendix E) as an example of how this recommended activity could be implemented in Bull Creek.

2.1.3 Horse Riding

A trail for horse riding is recommended in the Slaughter Creek Watershed.

2.1.4 Hunting

Hunting with primitive camping is recommended on the Lower Bear and Onion Creek Watersheds. The Utility has a substantial need to reduce deer, feral hog and black buck populations. See the Austin Woods and Waters Proposal (Appendix D) as an example how this recommended activity could be implemented.

2.1.5 Mountain Biking

Mountain biking trails are recommended on the Upper Barton, Bull and Slaughter Creek Watersheds. The Upper Barton Creek recommendation is limited to use not in conflict

with the Golden-cheeked Warbler breeding season. See the Austin Ridge Rider Proposal (Appendix C) as an example of how this recommended activity could be implemented.

2.1.6 Organized Sports

While the SSC did not achieve consensus on a recommendation concerning organized sports, it did achieve consensus on its own willingness and strong encouragement of other organizations and governmental entities to support the South Austin Youth Soccer Association's effort to find land for additional soccer fields.

2.2 Conditionally Recommended Public Use

2.2.1 Hiking

Hiking trails are conditionally recommended on the Lower Barton and Lower Bear Watersheds.

2.2.2 Mountain Biking

Mountain bike trails are conditionally recommended on the Lower Barton, Lower Bear and Onion Creek Watersheds.

2.2.3 Horse Riding

A horse riding trail is conditionally recommended on the Onion Creek Watershed.

2.3 Additional Consensus Recommendations

- Access for people with disabilities should be considered in the design of all multi-use trails and be provided where appropriate.
- On-site and off-site parking needs to be managed for their potential negative impacts.
- Picnicking as an event was not recommended, but trail users will be allowed to eat on the properties.
- All users will be required to "pack it in and pack it out."

Appendix A Stakeholder Criteria and Characteristics

Stakeholder Criteria

- A representative from an organization or entity that has an interest in the use of public land that is consistent with the goal of preserving water quality and quantity, and who...
 - ✓ Has decision-making authority for that organization.
 - ✓ Is able to attend all meetings (biweekly over 4-6 months, and less frequently after the plan is submitted), or send a designated alternate.
 - ✓ Is willing to identify and bring resources to the table that will contribute to the implementation of the desired use.

Desirable Stakeholder Characteristics

- Is articulate and constructive in presenting viewpoints
- Ability to listen to others
- Willingness to consider other viewpoints and be influenced
- Willingness to understand and accept the consensus-building process
- Willingness to abide by the parameters given up-front
- Willingness to trust the process so that all stakeholders may achieve, at a minimum, a portion of their desired land use
- Willingness to become more aware of environmental issues
- Willingness to consider the interests in the public good
- Willingness to accurately represent the findings, proceedings and conclusions to their organization

Appendix B

Stakeholder Steering Committee Consensus Process Agreement General Guidelines

I. Goal

Members of the Water Quality Protection Lands Stakeholder Committee (SC) will seek consensus on a conceptual plan for public access to the Water Quality Protection Lands. Consensus agreements will be proposed as a part of a plan recommended by the Land Management Planning Group (LMPG) to the Water and Wastewater Commission and, ultimately, to the Austin City Council for approval. The conceptual plan will say what public access will be allowed, where and how it will be allowed, and how it will be funded.

II. Participants

- a. Stakeholder Groups. Each of 21 key stakeholder organizations will have one Committee member at these meetings. City of Austin Water and Wastewater Utility will be one of the stakeholder organizations. The group, as a whole, will receive input from the general public and each organization will get input from its members or constituents and bring it to the group for consideration.
- b. Representation of group interests. Stakeholder groups are strongly urged to name a Committee member (and alternate) through a formal process or at least with input from a large percentage of their members. The members will represent the interests of their organization, rather than their individual interests.
- c. Alternates. Alternate members may be named. Only the Committee member and the alternate may participate in decision making. If the member is present at a meeting, the alternate may sit behind the member in order to be available to advise or discuss with the member, but will not participate in decision making. Members are responsible for preparing their alternates for meeting participation (see section Vb.).
- d. Open meetings. Constituents of the groups represented at the table, the general public, and the media may attend and observe the meetings, but may not participate in discussions, unless invited, or in decision making. Observation seating will be provided at each meeting.
- e. Public Input. The public may provide input to the committee through written comments, email comments, comments at public meetings, and direct involvement with organizations on the Committee. The Committee may decide at a future date on additional strategies for obtaining public input.
- f. Media Contact. Members and alternates will characterize their remarks to the press as being from them as individuals or from their organization, rather than from the Stakeholder Committee as a whole. Questions concerning what

happened at the meeting will be handled by referring to the approved meeting summaries. If consensus is reached, all members and alternates agree to support it publicly and to refrain from disagreeing with it in the media.

III. Decision-Making and Internal Organization

- a. Use of Consensus. The SC will operate by consensus. Consensus is defined as each member agreeing to support an item. Committee decisions will be made only with the concurrence of all members represented at that meeting. All members share responsibility for the process and the decisions. When consensus is close, but someone disagrees, the member who disagrees must state the reasons for their objection and state an idea for how their needs can be met.
- b. Failure to Reach Consensus. If the SC cannot reach consensus on an item, the facilitators will record the various opinions expressed by the Committee and this information will be provided in full to the LMPG. The LMPG will consider this input, as well as input from the general public and other organizations, and will make the recommendations it believes are most appropriate. Committee members retain their right to comment positively or negatively about any item on which the group was unable to agree.
- c. Agendas. Draft meeting agendas will be developed by the facilitator and approved by the SC at the start of each meeting. Draft agendas will be sent to members no less than 24 hours in advance of the meeting.
- d. Meeting Summaries. A summary of each meeting will be prepared and distributed to all SC members. The summary will include an attendance list, summary of actions taken, and other pertinent information. Meeting summaries will be approved at the following SC meeting.

IV. Safeguards for the Representatives

- a. Good Faith. All members must act in good faith in all aspects of these meetings.
- b. Withdrawal from Group. Any member or stakeholder group may withdraw from the Committee at any time without prejudice. If a primary member withdraws and the group wishes to continue to participate in the process, the alternate will be asked to take on the primary member responsibilities. The need to select another alternate under these circumstances will be determined by that organization.
- c. Respect. Committee members will be expected to interact with each other respectfully and to follow any guidelines agreed upon by the group.

V. Responsibilities of the Representatives

- a. Attendance. Members or their alternates will make good faith efforts to be present at every meeting.

- b. Preparation for meetings. Members and alternates serving as members are expected to prepare for all meetings as deemed necessary by the group. This may involve reading, consulting with their group for advice or direction, or preparing proposals or presentations for the group. Stakeholders may want to consult with other stakeholders if they need clarification about information or consensus recommendations.
- c. Regular contact with your organization. Members will be expected to keep their organization informed on issues being discussed and to get regular input from their organization as to their organization's concerns and interests.

VI. Responsibilities of the Facilitator

The primary task of the facilitators is to guide the meetings of the Stakeholder Committee within the agreed upon ground rules and protocols and in accordance with the Standard Practices for Facilitators.

VII. Schedule

The SC will establish a regular schedule for its meetings. The full SC will not meet more often than once every two weeks, except by consensus of the group. Task groups or other subcommittees may meet at their discretion. A location for the meetings will be selected based on convenience of the group, availability and cost.

VIII. Ground Rules for Interaction

The process used will be voluntary, informal and flexible. Members will develop and help enforce a set of meeting ground rules. Such ground rules may include:

- Listen with respect to differences.
- Speak one at a time.
- Be concise and let everyone participate.
- Focus on the problem, not the person.
- Stay on the task.
- Speak your piece.

Ground rules may be amended by consensus at any meeting.

Standard Practices for Facilitators in Agreement Seeking Processes*

The following guidelines govern the facilitator in the conduct of his or her role in agreement-seeking processes.

1. Facilitators will not participate in any process that is misrepresented as to its purpose or that is intended to circumvent legal requirements.
2. Facilitators will serve as advocates for the principles that underlie collaborative decision-making processes, including structuring and managing the process to

- ensure representation and effective participation by all key stakeholders, whatever their cultural, racial, religious or economic backgrounds.
3. Facilitators will not be advocates for any participant's point of view on any substantive issue.
 4. Facilitators will protect the confidentiality of private communications with any of the participants.
 5. Facilitators will need to gain the agreement of all participants to the ground rules for the process and to any subsequent modification of them.
 6. Once ground rules have been mutually agreed upon, facilitators will enforce them impartially.
 7. Facilitators will confront the sponsoring agency when they believe the agency is not acting in good faith, is inhibiting their ability to communicate or manage communications with participants, or is otherwise not abiding by the ground rules and will withdraw from the process if the issues cannot be resolved satisfactorily.
 8. Facilitators will withdraw from the process if his or her continuing involvement is not acceptable to the group.
 9. Facilitators will not be engaged by the sponsoring agency to carry out other kinds of activities for the agency at the same time as they are under contract to facilitate an agreement-seeking process or processes. Facilitators should disclose when they have continuing or frequent contractual relationships with one or more of the participants.

*From Report and Recommendations of the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution (SPIDR) Environment/ Public Disputes Sector Critical Issues Committee.

Appendix C

Proposal by Austin Ridge Riders ACTIVITY PROPOSAL FOR THE CITY OF AUSTIN WATER QUALITY PROTECTION LANDS

The Austin Ridge Riders, a Texas non-profit corporation (ARR), proposes to design, build, and maintain trail systems within and upon the lands controlled and managed by the City of Austin Water and Wastewater Department (WWW), and designated as Water Quality Protection Lands.

The purpose of the proposed trail system is to provide various approved users with the opportunity to observe the management of and improvements to water quality as the management plan is implemented, to be exposed to, and gain appreciation for, the natural beauty of the lands and to learn how they play a vital role in the conservation and preservation of both water quantity and quality in this important area. Users will also be able to monitor the lands for adverse uses (squatters' campsites, dumping, vandalism, etc.) and, by their very presence, discourage such uses or actions.

The trails will be designed with the following considerations:

- Environmentally sensitive features
- Sustainability of the trail
- Topography of the land
- Aesthetic appeal to users

The trail design will be the responsibility of the ARR with oversight and approval of the WWW. The ARR has partnered previously with other volunteer groups to build and maintain trails in the Austin area, and anticipates doing so in this case. The cost of building natural tread, primitive trails is, in our experience, very low, in the range of \$100/mile, excluding bridges or other structures, which would be utilized only as a last resort. Various sources of grant funds for trail development are available, and most allow for volunteer hours to apply as in-kind match funds. The ARR has participated in the application process for such grants in the past, and will pursue such funding as required for this proposed trail system.

The design process can commence immediately upon final approval of the access plan by the City of Austin. The general sequence of design and construction is:

- Conduct site survey – note sensitive features and places of interest
- Flag the proposed trail route, plan for any structures or mitigation needs
- Construct the trail – see attached Trail Specifications
- Install final amenities, such as the trailhead area, educational signage and kiosks, and others as deemed necessary or beneficial.

The ARR proposes to cooperate with the WWW in the development and dissemination of public awareness and educational materials, through kiosks, trail signage, public seminars, guided tours of the lands, and other means, as may be suggested.

The Austin Mountain Bike Patrol is an established group within the ARR, and works in cooperation with the Austin Parks Police to monitor the local trails, providing public education and mechanical and first aid assistance to users. It is our intent to provide this service on the proposed trails once they are in use.

This proposal is presented as a preliminary document to provide a basis for a memorandum of agreement between the parties mentioned herein, and other stakeholders who may wish to participate in said agreement.

Presented April 5, 2001, by the Austin Ridge Riders, Inc.
Mark G. Zahn,
Stakeholder Representative

Appendix D

Austin Woods and Waters Club - Austin Water Quality Protection Lands Public Use/Activity Proposal Form

1. Proposal Sponsor and contact information:

Austin Woods and Waters Club: Eric C. Hansen 8723 Shoal Creek Blvd. Austin, TX 78757

512/450-0007 (O) 512/454-9306 (Fax) eric@equickgifts.com

Austin Woods and Waters Club: Jeff Lawlor 10600 McFarlie Cove Austin, TX 78750
512/971-7875 (O) 512/257-9021 (Fax) jefflawlor@juno.com

2. WHAT - Please describe the proposed public use/activity.

Youth sponsored deer, feral hog, and exotic game hunts. Hunts will be coordinated through the Texas Youth Hunters Program. The two proposed tracts for these hunts are the Rutherford and Hays County Ranches. Scheduled weekends with closed access to the property are contemplated and recommended. Primitive, Zero impact camping during these weekends is requested.

Proposal for the 2001 – 2002 White tailed Deer Hunting season (or the first available hunting season as appropriate) isto schedule 8 two-day hunts to accommodate up to 10 hunters on Hays County Ranch and up to 12 hunters on Rutherford Ranch for each hunt.

3. WHY - What benefits to the Water Quality Protection Program will be provided by the proposal?

The primary reason for proposing this activity is to assist Water Quality Protection Lands staff with management of white tailed deer, feral hog, and exotic wildlife populations. WQPL staff has proposed population management for the following reasons:

1. Over browsing and overgrazing by wildlife are causing unacceptable changes to plant community structure.
2. Changes in plant community structure is contributing to a long term decline in runoff and percolation of water available for recharge.
3. Changes in plant community structure are contributing to a long term decline in water quality
4. Changes in plant community structure are contributing to a loss of habitat for endangered species, deer and other large ungulates, and some species of small mammals and ground inhabiting birds
5. Over populations of deer and exotic species are contributing to threats to herd health for these species.
6. Over populations of deer may be contributing to public safety hazards on adjoining public roads and private property
7. Rooting by hogs is threatening water quality at onsite surface water bodies and near recharge features.

4. WHERE - Where will the proposed use/activity be accommodated (attach map if possible)?

Rutherford and Hays County Ranches.

5. HOW - How will the proposed use/activity be implemented?

Please describe and/or attach your conceptual plan or your design criteria for the proposal.

The Texas Youth Hunting Program (TYHP) is a division of the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department and part of Texas Wildlife Association. Formed in 1995, the goal of TYHP is to provide every youth in the state that wants to go hunting a safe and educational hunt. Landowners from around the state who are in need of game management open their ranches to the TYHP and allow the youth of Texas to experience a hunt they might otherwise not be able to access.

TYHP requires of its youth the following:

- Be between 12 - 17 years of age.
- Have completed the state mandated Hunter Education program.
- Have gone to a target range and certified proven their proficiency by having three “bulls-eyes” with their weapon and bring the target to the TYHP staff.
- Have a valid hunting license with appropriate tags.
- Be accompanied by his or her “own” adult, in most cases the mother or father.
- Have executed required TYHP release and medical forms.
- Attend additional multiple educational and training sessions during the weekend hunt.

TYHP provides \$2 million of commercial liability insurance protection to the landowner while the hunts are conducted. TYHP and its’ volunteers who are specially trained hunters known as Huntmasters conduct all facets of the hunt from beginning to successful conclusion. The Huntmasters are long-time experienced hunters who go through a 30-hour three-day intensive training weekend with TYHP and Texas Parks & Wildlife (TP&W) staff prior to certification.

A typical weekend hunt involves the parents and youth arriving at the ranch on Friday. Each youth and his/her parent are required to stay the entire weekend, and if unable to, a replacement will be found. All rifles are checked in and are kept locked & secure until the hunts are conducted, and all handling of firearms are only in the presence of a supervising adult. All ammunition is kept only in parent’s possession and locked in vehicles, not by youth. A target range is set up and the youths are tested again in their proficiency. Any youth who cannot safely and accurately shoot his/her weapon will be tested with one of the staff’s weapons or asked to only participate in the hunts without a weapon (i.e. Camera or binoculars). That evening the youth are re-oriented in safety and hunt orientation, review of game laws, wildlife management and identification, firearms/ammunition inspection and a hunt guide orientation. The next morning each qualified youth will head out to a blind (usually a stationary ground blind) with his/her parent, and if their parent is not a skilled hunter, a Huntmaster guide will attend. Before

shooting, both the youth hunter and guide must agree that it is a proper animal, there is a good possibility of a kill, it is legal, and it is ethical. During the 2000-2001 season, TYHP recorded 1,000 youth hunters, 800 deer harvested and three lost deer. If a deer is wounded, all activity is ceased and TYHP, the Huntmaster's and youths make every effort possible to retrieve said animal. One of the highest priorities of all ethical hunters and a particularly high priority & written TYHP regulation is the recovery of all shot game. Please add language about the virtual hunting, shoot don't shoot training. The youth are required as an educational activity to process all game that is killed. All processed deer will be kept in coolers and transported in coolers (not on trailers, or on vehicle fenders or even the back of pick-ups). The WQLP has offered to provide a dumpster for entrails that will be bagged and properly disposed.

One evening TYHP likes to have a hunting/wildlife related educational program around a campfire or fireplace if possible. Many times this program is conducted by a TP&W educational staff member or law enforcement game warden. Game wardens are invited and encouraged to attend all hunts.

Other rules of the hunt include:

- All youths are required to perform camp chores and clean up. Zero impact camps.
- Alcohol and tobacco products are not allowed.
- TYHP reserves the right to remove any hunting party due to unsafe, unethical, or flagrant behavior.
- TYHP reserves the right to cancel the hunt due to unsafe conditions (usually dangerous weather).
- Vehicle travel will be at a minimum, and youth will remain seated in the beds at all times.
- Wear blaze orange vests and hats at all times, for everyone on property.
- Furnish their own bedding and linens.
- Hunting from designated blinds only.
- Youth only have possession of ammunition when a clean shot is available and only 1 bullet in their possession at a time.
- Youth do not leave camp, group or adult supervision at any time.

AWWC and TYHP will provide a minimum of ____? ____ huntmasters for each hunt at each site.

What mitigation features are proposed?

1. all game will be processed, bagged and removed.
2. Zero impact camping will be strictly adhered to.
3. Portable toilets will be brought if necessary and removed.
4. Campfire coals will be removed, etc...

What, if any, limitations or constraints are proposed?

1. for safety purposes, the ranches be closed to public access.

2. All AWWC and TYHP rules, safety procedures, hunter training and education, and hunter qualifying procedures will be used as described above.
3. Wounded game retrieval procedures described above will be strictly adhered to.

Please describe and/or attach your budget including all sources and uses of funds for the construction or capital expenses.

No city funding is being requested as all expenses associated with the hunt(s) are borne by the Austin Woods & Waters, TYHA and other sponsors, the youth hunters and their families. The youth hunters are asked to remit a fee of \$50 if financially able, more as a token of recognition that they are being allowed a special experience and that it costs real money to conduct those weekends.

As previously stated, the WQLP staff has offered a dumpster at their expense for game remnants.

AWWC will reimburse COA WQPL for Deer Lease Permit Fees.

AWWC and TYHP will provide all stands, feeders, coolers, processing equipment, and any other materials or supplies needed to implement this plan, except a dumpster.

Please attach your budget including all sources and uses of funds for the anticipated ongoing operations of the proposal.

funding sources include Texas Youth Hunters Program, Austin Woods and Waters Club, McBride's Conservation Foundation, sponsors and youth participants.

6. WHO-

Will be responsible for design/site specific planning?

Jeff Lawlor with the Austin Woods and Waters Club, Board of Director Member and Chairperson of The Youth Hunting Program, and Jerry Warden Director of the TYHP in collaboration with WQPL Staff

Will obtain resources (cash, volunteers, equipment, supplies, etc.)?

Texas Youth Hunters Program, Austin Woods and Waters Club, McBride's Conservation Foundation, sponsors and youth participants.

Will provide on-going management assistance (overall operations, public education, security, safety, monitoring)?

Texas Youth Hunters Program and Austin Woods and Waters Club, Texas Wildlife Association and Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, WQPL Staff.

7. When - Please describe and/or attach your schedule for implementing this proposal?

As soon as feasible given the WQLP's desire.

We propose initiating this proposal during the 2001-2002 White tailed deer hunting seasons governed by regulations for Antlerless and Spike Deer Management permits (October 20, 2001 through January 20, 2002), or any subsequent hunting season as appropriate.

Appendix E

Bull Creek Foundation - Austin Water Quality Protection Lands Public Use/Activity Proposal Form

The following proposal form is intended to assist the City of Austin staff and scientific advisors in evaluating proposed public uses and activities on Water Quality Protection (Prop 2) Lands.

If you have questions about this form, please contact Ted Siff, William Conrad or Steve Windhager.

Please submit completed form on or before April 5, 2001 to:

Steve Windhager, Ph.D.
Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center
4801 La Crosse Avenue
Austin, Texas 78739
Stevev@wildflower.org

and

Ted Siff, Principal
Creating Common Ground
1809 Palma Plaza
Austin, Texas 78703-3932
tedsiff@earthlink.net

1. Proposal Sponsor and contact information:

Charlie McCabe, Volunteer Project Leader, Trail Work, Bull Creek Foundation, 1818 West 39th Street, Austin, TX 78731 (home: 461-2887, work: 674-8814, email: cmccabe@apple.com)

2. WHAT - Please describe the proposed public use/activity.

Stenis Tract: 1. Perform prescribed migration work as determined by Steve Windhager and Willy Conrad & team. Work can include: repairing and installing fencing, cutting and removal of trees, brush and invasive species, building mitigation barriers to slow water flow, seed or sow areas to be re-vegetated. 2. Educate public by placing kiosks at entrances of proposed trails through properties, provide signage along proposed trail to inform public of importance of not straying from trails. 3. Build simple hike and bike trail through least sensitive areas of Stenis Tract. 4. Monitor, maintain and enhance trail, kiosks, signage and mitigation on an ongoing basis. In summary, we're committed to making this process work and are committed for the longer term – at least the first five-year management plan.

3. WHY – What benefits to the Water Quality Protection Program will be provided by the proposal?

1. Provide mitigation services. Willy Conrad and team have given us a quick overview of what needs to be done in the Stenis Tract. We will provide all labor and materials to complete these as well as any other work to be determined by Willy Conrad & team. Since Stenis is a smaller tract, we believe that this would be doable and sustainable, as Bull Creek Foundation sponsors approx. 10 workdays per year for the past

five and a half years and we've had no shortage of helpful volunteers to complete the work we've taken on.

2. Commitment. Bull Creek Foundation has and will continue to be committed to the area where the Stenis Tract lies. This was a key piece of land that we sought to have protected and it fits in with our goals of stewardship and "learn by doing." Further, it fits in with our continued focus to protect the Old Spicewood Springs Road Corridor where Stenis is located.

4. WHERE – Where will the proposed use/activity be accommodated (attach map if possible)?

We propose that the trail be sited along the least sensitive land as determined by Steve Windhager and team on the Bull Creek maps. Essentially, the trail would run in Treatment areas 1 and 2, with one end sited off of the low water crossing road, approx. 100 yards or so off of Old Spicewood Springs and Loop 360 and the other end near the edge of the Stenis property near Bridge #1 on Old Spicewood Springs Road. We would also look into providing one or two spur trails, which would provide a "dead-end" overlook of the creek. Exact location of the spur trails would need to be determined by BCF and COA working together.

5. HOW – How will the proposed use/activity be implemented?

Please describe and/or attach your conceptual plan or your design criteria for the proposal.

Overall, we are trying to demonstrate that we can build, construct and maintain a trail that lies in WQPL properties, that is adjacent to other greenbelt trails, parking, and rest room facilities in the Bull Creek Greenbelt. We will provide education (kiosks, signage) all mitigation work and maintenance in exchange for the opportunity to make this project work in four parts:

- 1) Work with LMPG to determine exactly what mitigation needs to be done and where trail should be placed.
- 2) Build and maintain kiosks and other educational signage to inform public of what we're doing and why.
- 3) Perform all mitigation work, including tree and brush removal (off property if necessary) build barriers, check dams and other elements to slow erosion, revegetate areas as determined.
- 4) Build hike and bike trail with signage, kiosks, fencing and other control elements as needed.

What mitigation features are proposed?

Final List will need to be determined by Willy and team, but can include:

- Brushing and cutting and removal of cedar (Ashe junipers) – includes removal off property, we have other areas along the Bull Creek Greenbelt where we can use brush and logs for migration.
- Build and maintain water bars, check dams and other structures to slow water flow where sheeting erosion and gully erosion is occurring.

- Keep people away from more sensitive land areas by trail routing, signage and if necessary, fencing and other barriers.
- If access into forbidden areas becomes an issue after these and other mitigation efforts are exhausted, we agree to support efforts by COA to close off access.

What, if any, limitations or constraints are proposed?

1. We'll make every effort to keep folks on trails and away from sensitive areas through kiosks, signage and if necessary, fencing and or barriers.
2. We agree to review work, progress, ongoing usage and any issues on a regular basis with COA.

Please describe and/or attach your budget including all sources and uses of funds for the construction or capital expenses.

We will fund through private donations as well as grants for materials, tools, signage, etc. All work is performed by volunteer labor donated by members and friends of Bull Creek Foundation. We currently have over \$10,000 dedicated to trail work that is not currently allocated.

Please attach your budget including all sources and uses of funds for the anticipated ongoing operations of the proposal.

We will have to provide this later once COA and BCF begin working together to determine work, route of trail and other factors. All funds are from private individuals at this time. We have received and used grants in the past from REI, TPWD, Hill Partners, EPA, NPS and other private and governmental organizations.

6. WHO-

Will be responsible for design/site specific planning?

COA and the Bull Creek Foundation

Will obtain resources (cash, volunteers, equipment, supplies, etc.)?

COA and the Bull Creek Foundation

Will be responsible for implementation and on-going maintenance?

COA and the Bull Creek Foundation

Will provide on-going management assistance (overall operations, public education, security, safety, monitoring)?

COA and the Bull Creek Foundation

7. When – Please describe and/or attach your schedule for implementing this proposal?

Pending review and approval by COA, proposed implementation time frame is no more than 1 yr. after approval.