



## 10 PLAN ADOPTION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This section describes the plan approval process for the Region F Water Plan and the efforts made to encourage public participation in the planning process. During the development of the regional water plan special efforts were made to inform the general public, water suppliers, and others with special interest in the planning process and to seek their input.

### 10.1 Regional Water Planning Group

As part of SB1 regional water planning groups were formed to guide the planning process. These groups were comprised of local representatives of eleven specific interests:

- General public
- Counties
- Municipalities
- Industrial
- Agricultural
- Environmental
- Small businesses
- Electric generating utilities
- River authorities
- Water districts
- Water utilities

Table 10.1-1 lists the voting members of the Region F Water Planning Group, the interests they represent, and their counties. The Region F Water Planning Group also has non-voting members to represent counties that are not otherwise represented by voting members. Table 10.1-2 lists the non-voting members. The Region F Water Planning Group held regular meetings during the development of the plan, receiving information from the region's consultants and making decisions on planning efforts. These meetings were open to the public, and proper notice was made under SB1 guidelines.

**Table 10.1-1**  
**Voting Members of the Region F Water Planning Group**

Name	Interest	County
Len Wilson	Public	Andrews
Wendell Moody	Public	Concho
Jerry Bearden (Ret)	Counties	Mason
Robert Moore	Counties	Runnels
Will Wilde	Municipalities	Tom Green
Merle Taylor	Municipalities	Scurry
John Shepard	Municipalities	Winkler
Buddy Sipes (Ret) Ben Shepperd	Industries	Midland
Kenneth Dierschke	Agricultural	Tom Green
Terry Scott	Agricultural	Coleman
Woody Anderson	Agricultural	Mitchell
Steven C. Hofer (Ret)	Environmental	Midland
Caroline Runge	Environmental	Menard
Stuart Coleman(Ret) Charles Hagood	Small Business	Brown Kimble
Tim Warren	Elec. Gen. Util.	Mitchell
Stephen Brown	River Authorities	Tom Green
John Grant	Water Districts	Howard
Scott Holland	Water Districts	Irion
Paul Weatherby	Water Districts	Pecos
Larry Turnbough	Water Districts	Reeves
Richard Gist	Water Utilities	Brown

(Ret) – Retired during this planning cycle.

**Table 10.1-2**  
**Non-Voting Members of the Region F Water Planning Group**

Name	County
Winton Milliff	Coke
Tom Hoysa	Coleman
Gordon Hooper	Crane
Debbie McReynolds	Ector
Rick Harston	Glasscock
Todd Darden	Howard
Billy Hopper	Loving
Ken Carver (Ret)	Martin
Don Daniel	Mason
Jill Reed	Midland
Sue Young	Mitchell
Michael McCulloch	Pecos
Cindy Weatherby	Reagan
Gary Foster	Sterling
Joe David Ross	Sutton
Lynn Halfmann	
John Evridge	Upton

(Ret) – Retired during this planning cycle.

## **10.2 Outreach to Water Suppliers, Water User Groups and Adjacent Regions**

The Region F Water Planning Group made special efforts to contact municipalities, water districts, and rural water supply corporations and others in the region and obtain their input in the planning process. Much of this outreach was conducted as part of the development of the special studies during the first biennium of the planning cycle. Outreach included both questionnaires and meetings with selected water user groups and wholesale water providers. The questionnaires sought information on water use projections, current sources of water and supplies, drought planning, water quality issues, water management strategies, and other water supply issues. Particular emphasis was placed on receiving input from water user groups with water supply needs.

Region F continued to coordinate with Region K regarding water supply in the Colorado River Basin and coordinated with water users in adjacent basins that receive water from Region F.

## 10.3 Outreach to the Public

The public were given opportunities to participate throughout the regional water planning process, including the following:

- Regional water planning group meetings held throughout the planning process presented opportunities for dissemination of information to the public and receiving public comments. Notices for the meetings were posted in accordance with TWDB rules.
- A website specific to Region F was developed to provide information on the planning process to the public and planning group members.
- During the special study interim period the special study workgroups held meetings open to the public
- Scope of Work, meeting minutes and other information were available on the Region F and TWDB websites.

## 10.4 Public Meetings and Public Hearings

As required by SB1 rules, the Region F Water Planning Group held an initial public hearing to discuss the planning process and the scope of work for the region on April 28, 2008. Presentations were made on the planning process and input was solicited from participants. Public meetings were held approximately every quarter throughout the planning process.

On May 26, 2010 copies of the *Initially Prepared Region F Water Plan* were mailed to Region F county courthouses and libraries for public review. Copies of the Initially Prepared plan were also posted on the Region F website. Notices of the upcoming public meetings were sent to the Secretary of State, county clerks, county judges, regional legislators, groundwater and irrigation districts, and regional newspapers along with a description of how to obtain copies of the draft plan for review.

On June 28, 2010, the Region F Water Planning Group held a public hearing in Big Spring to present the draft *Initially Prepared Region F Water Plan* and seek public input. Oral comments were received following the presentation and written comments were

accepted through August 28, 2010. There were no oral comments at the public hearing. Public comments received during the comment period are documented in Appendix 10A. Where appropriate, modifications to the plan were made and incorporated into the adopted *Regional Water Plan*. Responses to the public comments are also included in Appendix 10A.

## **10.5 Comments from State and Federal Agencies**

Appendix 10B contains comments on the *Initially Prepared Region F Water Plan* from the Texas Water Development Board and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. No other comments were received from other state or federal agencies. Responses to agency comments are documented in Appendix 10B. Where appropriate, modifications to the plan were made and incorporated into the adopted *Region F Water Plan*.

## **10.6 Plan Implementation Issues**

Implementation issues identified for the Region F *Regional Water Plan* include: 1) financial issues associated with paying for the proposed capital improvements, 2) additional studies associated with subordination of Colorado Basin water rights, and 3) implementation of conservation measures that were assumed in this plan.

### **10.6.1 Financial Issues**

It is assumed that the entities for which strategies were developed will utilize existing financial resources, incur debt through bond sales and/or receive state-supported financial assistance. Most likely the funding of identified strategies will increase the cost of water to the customers. The economic feasibility to implement the strategies will depend on the cost increases the customer base can assume. Some strategies may not be able to be implemented without state assistance.

### **10.6.2 Additional Water Rights Studies in the Colorado Basin**

The subordination strategy described in Section 4.2.3 is intended as an interim solution to water rights issues associated with use of the TCEQ Colorado WAM for regional water planning. The results are for planning purposes only. Additional studies will be required to clarify water rights issues in the Colorado Basin.

### **10.6.3 Water Conservation**

Water conservation practices evaluated in this plan are based on rule-of-thumb information, primarily based on the experience in other states. Data collected as part of the special study on municipal conservation found that cities in Region F are implementing conservation measures, but it is difficult to quantify savings. Savings associated with irrigation conservation are based on estimated conversion rates that must be implemented by the irrigator. There is no confirmation that irrigation water saved will be available for future use. Experience during the recent droughts has demonstrated that significant savings can be made through water conservation and drought management. However, without specific data, it is difficult to quantify the potential long-term savings for water conservation activities and rely on these savings to meet future needs.