

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
REGION F WATER PLANNING GROUP
10:00 A.M., THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2013 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, July 18, 2013 at the Office of the Colorado River Municipal Water District in Big Spring, Texas. Voting members present were: Wendell Moody, Len Wilson, Richard Gist, Caroline Runge, Scott Holland, Merle Taylor, John Grant, John Shepard, Paul Weatherby, Gil Van DeVenter, Jerry Bearden. Terry Scott, Larry Turnbough, Charles Hagood, Tim Warren, Kenneth Dierschke, Stephen Brown, Robert Moore, Woody Anderson, Ben Shepperd, and Raymond Straub were absent. Notices were received from Kenneth Dierschke and Charles Hagood that they would not be able to attend the meeting. Non-voting members present were: Doug Shaw, Leatrice Adams, Michael McCulloch, Harvey Everheart, and Jon Cartwright. Other interested parties present were Simone Kiel and Lissa Perry, Freese & Nichols; Ricky Dickson, City of San Angelo; Darrell Peckham, Water Quest, Inc.; Geoff Williams, Williams Ranch; Allan Lange, Lipan Kickapoo WCD; John Stokes, Senator Robert Duncan's office; Slate Williams, Crockett County GCD; James Beach, LBG-Guyton; Mark Barr, Howard County Judge; David Dunn, HDR; Gregg Blain, K-Bar Well and Electric; Jim Blischke, Permian Basin Master Gardeners; 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 10:06 a.m. A quorum was present.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

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

Consider Approval of Minutes for the Region F Meeting on March 21, 2013

Motion was made by Caroline Runge and seconded by Paul Weatherby to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Report

John Grant presented the financial reports for the Administrative and Planning Funds.

Expenditures from the Administrative Fund were \$75.42. Expenditures from the Planning Fund to Freese and Nichols were \$46,425.06, minus the 5% retainage, totaling \$44,103.81. Len Wilson motioned and Wendell Moody seconded to accept the report. The motion passed unanimously.

Consider Voting Membership

Several Voting Member positions expired in September 2011, and nominations for those positions, as well as an unfilled vacancy were posted. The executive committee made the following recommendations, the only nominations received for these positions:

Public – Reappointment of Wendell Moody

Counties – Appointment of Mark Barr, Howard County

Municipalities, Population Greater than 50,000 – Appointment of Ricky Dickson, City of San Angelo

Municipalities, Population Less than 10,000 – Reappointment of John Shepard

Electric Generating Utility – Reappointment of Tim Warren

Water District, Regional Water Supplier – Reappointment of John Grant

Water Utilities – Reappointment of Richard Gist

Motion was made by Merle Taylor and seconded by Caroline Runge to accept the Executive Committee's recommended action. The motion passed unanimously.

Industries – Nominations were received from incumbent Ben Sheppard and Gregg Blain of K-Barr Well and Electric, Ector County. Merle Taylor motioned, seconded by John Sheperd to consider this position at the next Planning Group meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Consider Designated Alternates

No action was taken.

Consider Non-voting Members

No action was taken.

TWDB Report

Doug Shaw presented the report. On the schedule, the Demand Revisions are due August 16th. They will be taken to the new Board at the TWDB in September. On November 5th, voters will decide whether to approve SJR1, which will create the SWIFT, and upon passage, would move \$2 B from the Rainy Day Fund into the account. Also upon passage, RWPGs and the TWDB will be asked to prioritize projects in RWPs and the SWP. Regional prioritization will be based on decade of need, feasibility, viability, sustainability, and cost effectiveness. The TWDB will convene the stakeholders committee in September to determine standards. The state water plan prioritization will be based on serving a large population, serving a diverse urban and rural population, providing regionalization, and meeting high percentage of water needs. It will also consider local contributions, repayment capacity, emergency needs, readiness to proceed, and demonstrated or projected impact on conservation. The role of the SWIFT Advisory Committee is to provide comments and recommendations to the Board regarding rulemaking related to SWP project prioritization and use of money in the fund, and to provide evaluations of various aspects of operation of the fund. The Committee recommendations on rules regarding SWP prioritization and disbursement of loans from the fund must be submitted to the Board by September 1, 2014. Rules for disbursement of loans from the fund will be finalized by the latter of (a) the 90th day after TWDB receives the SWIFT Advisory Committee recommendations or (b) March 1, 2015. 20%

of loan funds are to target conservation and reuse projects, and 10% of loan funds are to target rural and irrigation conservation projects.

Discuss Draft Population and Municipal Water Demands

Simone Kiel presented the report. The TWDB draft population and demand projections were sent to the RWPG March 2013. A survey was sent to each WUG for comment in May 2013. Changes were suggested based on survey results. Out of all the WUGs, 43% sent responses in and 57% did not. 14 WUGs needed changes; 6 for population adjustments, 7 GPCD changes, and 3 Plumbing Code Implementation Rate Changes. Population changes under Errors and Corrections include the Zephyr WSC and Brown County Other due to acquisition of new CCN. There was a net zero change. Population changes due to the active Permian Basin Shale oil boom include the Cities of Andrews, Midland, Miles, and San Angelo. There has been recent sharp increase in growth rates not captured by the 2010 census. Increased growth rates were added in near decades, and leveled off growth rate in subsequent decades. Population changes due to the expected Cline Shale oil boom include Colorado City and the City of Snyder. Those changes have yet to happen, but they were modeled after growth rates currently seen in the Permian Basin oil boom. The differences in the Region F population from the TWDB Draft Total to the Proposed Total are a 2% increase in 2020, 3% in 2030, 3% in 2040, 4% in 2050, 4% in 2060, and 5% in 2070. Baseline GPCD Changes include corrections in Colorado City. Dry Year GPCD adjustments include the Cities of Big Spring, Brownwood, Midland, Odessa, Robert Lee, and Snyder. Plumbing Code Implementation Rate Changes include the City of Bangs, Brookesmith SUD, and the City of Brownwood. The difference in the TWDB Draft Demand and the Proposed Demand Changes are in increase of 12% in 2020, 13% in 2030, 13% in 2040, 14% in 2050, 14% in 2060, and 15% in 2070.

Discuss Draft Non-Municipal Water Demands

Simone Kiel presented the report. The previously approved demands that have been accepted by TWDB are Irrigation Demands, Steam-Electric Demands, and Manufacturing Demands. The RWPG revised the TWDB Draft Livestock Demands and included Exotic/Wildlife Water Demand. The TWDB denied the request for increased demand due to Exotics/Wildlife. The new proposed Livestock Demands do not include Exotics/Wildlife. The TWDB Draft Livestock Demands were 14,622 ac-ft and the RWPG Revised Demands are 16,940 ac-ft. The projections from the 2012 BEG Report Update were presented at the last RWPG meeting. One comment was received, and no changes have been made.

Consider Approval of the Draft Population, Municipal Water Demands, and Non-Municipal Water Demands

Merle Taylor motioned and Scott Holland seconded to approve the Draft Population, Municipal Water Demands, and Non-Municipal Water Demands. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Groundwater Supplies

James Beach presented the report. There are Groundwater Management Areas in Region F and there are many Groundwater Conservation Districts. The GCDs determine the Desired Future Conditions through the joint groundwater planning process. There is a modeled maximum amount of groundwater that can be pumped to hit or not exceed the DFC target in the future. The TWDB calculates the Managed Available Groundwater with models or other quantitative approaches. The second round of joint groundwater planning is underway. For long term planning, there are 3 shifting targets; DFCs, MAGs, and strategies, plus 2 outside forces of case law and legislature. For 2016 Regional Water Planning, TWDB policy does not allow groundwater strategies that use more than the MAG. MAGs generally do not differentiate between fresh and brackish groundwater. The next steps needed are to compare MAGs to groundwater demands from all WUGs, calculate system capacities, determine needs, and assess groundwater strategies.

Consider Review and Approval of the Draft Scope of Work and Budget for Task 4D

Simone Kiel presented the report. The TWDB defines the scope of work by tasks that are generally associated with each chapter of the plan. One of the things that the TWDB has done with its contracts for this planning cycle is to require the consultants and the Planning Group to develop the scope of work for Identifying and Evaluating Water Management Strategies. That task is Task 4D. It requires the consultant to bring to the Planning Group a scope of work for water management strategies. There are 30 Water Management Strategies from the 2011 plan that are anticipated to be retained in the 2016 plan. 5 strategies from the 2011 plan have been implemented. Those strategies are the CRMWD Ward County well field expansion, the Big Spring reuse project, the Midland T-Bar Ranch well field development, Phase 1 of the Hickory well field for San Angelo, and the Eden RO plant is in progress. There are several new Water Management Strategies including the West Texas Water Partnership (Midland and San Angelo), Reuse projects (Midland, Brownwood, Crockett Co. WCID #1, non-municipal users), infrastructure improvements with purchase (Bronte), Desalination (CRMWD Diverted Water System and Odessa brackish desalination), new groundwater with ASR (CRMWD), and the Red Arroyo surface water project. The City of Junction plans on dredging of intake storage. There are new mining strategies including new groundwater, voluntary re-distribution, and reuse. The Water Management Strategy Scope is a working draft. It includes 6 major strategy types: subordination, conservation, desalination, infrastructure improvements, new groundwater development, and voluntary re-distribution. The next steps are to coordinate with Wholesale Water Providers on future strategies, develop draft needs analysis and identify WUGs with needs, refine list of Potentially Feasible Strategies, finalize scope of work and fee, and the RWPG approval of scope and fee.

John Grant said this item needs to be reviewed further. The consultants need to look at what the Region's current needs are, what the new needs are, review existing supplies, and then evaluate the needs to better define the strategy.

Next Meeting Date

Then next meeting date on the schedule is October 17, 2013. John Grant said that the Planning Group needed to meet prior to that to review the Scope of Work and Budget for

Task 4D. The next meeting date will be a Thursday in September. Notice will be sent out when the date is set.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.



Wendell Moody, Secretary
Region F Water Planning Group



John Grant, Chair
Region F Water Planning Group