

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
REGION F WATER PLANNING GROUP
10:00 A.M., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2014 AT THE OFFICE OF THE
COLORADO RIVER MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT,
400 E. 24TH ST. BIG SPRING, TEXAS**

The Region F Water Planning Group (WPG) met at 10:00a.m. on Thursday, November 20, 2014 at the Office of the Colorado River Municipal Water District in Big Spring, Texas. Voting members present were: Wendell Moody, Don Daniel; Designated Alternate for Terry Scott, Alan Zeman, Ricky Dickson, Len Wilson, Richard Gist, Scott Holland, Kenneth Dierschke, Merle Taylor, Stephen Brown, John Grant, John Shepard, Raymond Straub, and Gil VanDeVenter Non-voting members present were: Harvey Everheart. Other interested parties present were Simone Kiel and Lissa Gregg, Freese & Nichols; David Messey, TWDB; Ken Carver, Glasscock GCD; Bryan Grimes and Sam Mallory, City of Ballinger; James Beach, LBG-Guyton; Gerald Sandusky and Ricky Rowe, City of Bronte; Allan Lange, Lipan-Kickapoo WCD; Laura Wilson, City of Midland; Darrell Peckham, Water Quest; Mandy Scott, TPWD; Aaron Wendt, TSSWCB; Gerry Jacobs and Steven Miller, City of Brady; and Jennifer Posey and Katharine Rubio (recorder of minutes) from the Colorado River Municipal Water District.

Call to Order

Chair, John Grant, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. A quorum was present.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

Voting and non-voting members and audience attendees introduced themselves.

Consider Approval of Minutes of the Region F Meeting on May 15, 2014

Motion was made by Len Wilson and seconded by Wendell Moody to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Discuss and Consider Approval of Amendment No. 6 to Contract #1148301317 between TWDB and CRMWD Related to Submission Timelines for the Initially Prepared Plan, Final 2016 Regional Water Plan, and Prioritization of 2016 Strategies

John Grant reported that CRMWD is the designated political subdivision for Region F.

David Messey said that because the TWDB had only partial money available, they were not able to contract for the whole amount. Each increment of money is amended to the contract. Stephen Brown motioned seconded by Gil VanDeVenter to approve Amendment No. 6 between TWDB and CRMWD. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Report

John Grant presented the financial reports for the Administrative and Planning Funds. Expenditures from the Administrative Fund were \$336.23. Expenditures from the Planning Fund to Freese and Nichols were \$133,598.68, minus the 5% retainage.

Richard Gist motioned and Kenneth Dierschke seconded to accept the report. The motion passed unanimously.

Consider Voting Members

John Grant reported that several voting members' terms expired September 1, 2014; Ricky Dickson, Kenneth Dierschke, Terry Scott, Caroline Runge, Charles Hagood, and Larry Turnbough. These positions were posted and nominations were received. The Executive Committee reviewed nominations and made the following recommendations, the only nominations received:

Municipalities, Population Greater than 50,000 – Reappointment of Ricky Dickson
Agriculture, Dryland Farming – Reappointment of Kenneth Dierschke
Small Business – Reappointment of Charles Hagood

Merle Taylor motioned, seconded by Wendell Moody to accept the nominations. The motion passed unanimously.

Effort will be made to find suitable candidates to fill the expired terms.

Consider Designated Alternates

Voting members can have a Designated Alternate. Designated Alternates must fill out a form and be approved by the Planning Group.

Consider Non-Voting Members

No action was taken.

TWDB Report

David Messey presented the report and said that the TWDB has started taking abridged applications for SWIFT Funding, and will be taking those through early February. After that point, all the applications received will be reviewed. Those that are eligible will be invited to submit a full application for funding next spring. SWIFT loans will be made available next fall. The deadline to submit the Initially Prepared Plan is May, 2015. Only Final Prioritizations will be required.

TSSWCB Brush Control Presentation

Aaron Wendt made the presentation. In the 2012 State Water Plan, brush control is discussed in 13 Regional Water Plans, and recommended in some form in 9 Regional Water Plans.

Discuss and Consider Approval of the Final Prioritization of 2011 Water Management Strategies

Simone Kiel presented the report. Final prioritization was submitted to TWDB on September 1, 2014, but it still needs to be approved by the RWPG. Stephen Brown

made a motion, seconded by Wendell Moody to approve the Final Prioritization of 2011 Water Management Strategies. The motion passed unanimously.

Discuss and Consider Ratification of the Technical Report on the Needs Analysis that was submitted to the TWDB on August 1

Simone Kiel presented the report. The technical memorandum includes 7 reports generated by the database; population, demand, source availability, source water balance, WUG category summary, existing supply, and needs/surplus. Overall, the needs are higher as a result of the new WAM. It was submitted to the TWDB on August 1, 2014. Gil VanDeVenter motioned and Richard Gist seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discuss and Consider Request to Adjust Basin Splits of Groundwater MAG Values for Selected Counties

James Beach presented the report. MAGs are developed by the counties. The basin split is made by the TWDB, but can be adjusted by the RWPG. Requirements for adjustments are a letter from the RWPG and impacts on the DFC. For the Edwards-Trinity Aquifer, the counties of concern are Regan, Upton, and Sutton Counties. For the Dockum Aquifer, Ector County is affected. LBG-Guyton has coordinated with the Sutton County UWCD and the Santa Rita UWCD. Both districts are in support of shifting availability across river basins as necessary for planning purposes. Ricky Dickson motioned and Merle Taylor seconded to request to adjust basin splits for MAG values. The motion passed unanimously.

Discuss Draft Chapters 2, 3, and 4

Simone Kiel presented the report. Chapter 2 includes the Population and Demand Projections. Chapter 3 is Water Supplies. Both are still drafts. Input and feedback from the Planning Group is appreciated. The new TCEQ WAM provided extended hydrology through December 2013 to reflect potential new drought of record and errors were corrected. Current supplies are lower than in the previous plan. There is a new drought of record for Lake Brownwood. Chapter 4 is the Needs Analysis. The first tier of needs is current supplies minus demands. The second tier of needs is current supplies minus demands plus conservation savings and direct reuse. The third tier of needs is current supplies minus demands plus conservation and reuse savings plus additional supplies from subordination. This is the need that is planned for when sizing infrastructure projects.

Discuss Subordination Strategy

Simone Kiel presented the report. TCEQ extended hydrology was used. The upper basin operates before any diversions from a lower basin. Region F reservoirs do not make calls on each other. The Pecan Bayou maintained the same assumptions, which is a 50% storage trigger for junior calls. Needs met fully by subordination are Coleman, Coleman County-Other, Coleman County Irrigation, Coleman County Manufacturing, Odessa, Big Spring, Stanton, Brady, Ballinger, Miles, and Snyder. Needs partially met by subordination are Bronte, Robert Lee, Coke County Mining, Coke County SEP, Howard County Mining, Junction, Midland, Millersview-Doole WSC, Mitchell County

SEP, Winters, Runnels County Manufacturing, San Angelo, and Tom Green Manufacturing.

Discuss Conservation Strategies

Simone Kiel presented the report. The municipal conservation approach included the screening of 68 BMPs for cost, potential water savings, time to implement, public acceptance, technical feasibility, and staff resources. The strategies selected were based on entities of greater than 20,000 population and entities less than 20,000 population. For entities less than 20,000, education and outreach, rate structure, and water waste ordinance were used. For entities greater than 20,000, education and outreach, rate structure, water waste ordinance, landscape ordinance, and time of day watering limit were used. The assumptions for BMPs were different for large vs. small cities. Water savings, implementation costs, and adoption rates for each BMP were included. Recommended for 57 WUGs; 8 are greater than 20,000 by 2070, 7 are County-Others with gpcd greater than 140, and 42 are cities/WSCs less than 20,000. For water savings, the low of 3 ac-ft per year is for McCulloch County-Other and the high of 1,236 ac-ft per year is Midland. The costs range from \$300 to greater than \$2,100 per ac-ft per year. Water audits and leak repair are not included in the general conservation package. It is expensive for smaller WUGs, but it is still included in the plan so users are eligible for earmarked SWIFT funds. It may be an alternate strategy for some. Irrigation conservation can be achieved through a combination of multiple strategies including: equipment changes, conversion to dry land farming, crop type and crop variety changes, and water loss reductions in irrigation canal systems. There is an assumed 5% increase per decade in irrigation efficiency from 2020-2040. The efficiency level held constant from 2050-2070, and the maximum efficiency level is assumed to be 85% for any given county. The irrigation conservation summary is recommended for all counties with an irrigation demand. There is a water savings high of 18,903 ac-ft on 2070 in Pecos County, and a low of 77 ac-ft in 2070 for Coleman County. The annual cost is \$51.09 per ac-ft saved, and \$0.16 per 1,000 gallons saved. Mining conservation includes the reuse/recycling of water already used for fracking or sand/gravel operations. There is an assumed 20% flowback for planning purposes and it was assumed 30% of the recoverable water was lost to treatment. There is a water savings high of 1,250 ac-ft in 2020 in McCulloch County and a low of 3 ac-ft in 2020 in Kimble County. The annual cost is \$124 to \$1.368 per ac-ft.

General Discussion Chapter 5

Simone Kiel presented the report. Chapter 5 will be mostly narrative and will list the potentially feasible Water Management Strategies and recommended WMSs for each Wholesale Water Provider and Water User Group. The chapter is organized by WWP and then by county. All WMS details and evaluations will be in an appendix, with the appendix organized by strategy type. Water management strategies already discussed are Conservation, which includes municipal, irrigation, and mining, as well as Subordination. Other types of water management strategies include reuse, expanded use of existing supplies, new groundwater, new surface water, desalination, regional water supply strategies, contracts and sales, and emergency transfer of water.

Discuss Legislative Recommendations

Simone Kiel presented the report. There were 46 legislative recommendations in the 2011 Plan. The Legislature has addressed some issues. SWIFT and SWIFRT address No. 18, SWIFT and SWIFRT conservation components address No. 25, and the joint planning process with GMAs addresses No. 37. There are current legislative initiatives between sessions. Those include encouraging the use of brackish groundwater, including, but not limited to ASR and desalination; the study and recommendations on what state and federal environmental regulations most affect implementations of water supply strategies in the State Water Plan, including recommendations to reduce state barriers; examination of current processes for environmental permitting, including the impact of permitting delays on economic development; monitoring implementation of legislation including monitoring implementation of House Bill 4, creating SWIFT; studying the economic impact of drought and water supply management on local communities that depend on non-consumptive or recreational uses of water for economic development purposes; consider whether the impacts of drought and water supply management on local lakeside economies should be considered in the state and regional water planning process while weighing these local impacts against the regional and statewide impacts of failing to meet consumptive water needs.

Discuss and Consider Creation and Charge of Emergency Water Supply Interconnect Subcommittee

John Grant presented the report. There is a new requirement to collect information regarding possible emergency interconnects. The nature of the information is confidential, and will not be published in the Plan, only submitted to the TWDB. This information is not appropriate for a public meeting. A subcommittee needs to be formed that can approve this portion of the Plan outside of a normal Planning Group meeting.

John Grant and Raymond Straub volunteered to be on the Emergency Water Supply Interconnect Subcommittee.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date will be Thursday February 19, 2015.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Wendell Moody, Secretary
Region F Water Planning Group

John Grant, Chair
Region F Water Planning Group