

# Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

November 21, 2014

10:00 a.m.

High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1 Office  
2930 Avenue Q, Lubbock TX

---

## 1. Call To Order and Welcome.

Chairman H. P. Brown Jr. called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. in the A. Wayne Wyatt Board Room of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1 office, 2930 Avenue Q, Lubbock, Texas. Notice of the meeting was provided to each voting/non-voting member and was also filed/posted in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act at the following locations: *Office of Texas Secretary of State, Office of Lubbock County Clerk, Lubbock County Courthouse, Administrative Offices of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1, the High Plains Water District web site at [www.hpwd.com](http://www.hpwd.com) and the regional water planning group web site at [www.llanoplan.org](http://www.llanoplan.org).*

## 2. Roll Call of Members and Establish Quorum.

**The following Llano Estacado Water Planning Group members were in attendance:** Dr. Melanie Barnes, Bruce Blalack, H. P. Brown Jr., Jason Coleman, Harvey Everheart, Richard Gillespie, Bill Harbin, Ronnie Hopper, Doug Hutcheson, Bob Josserand, Mark Kirkpatrick, Michael McClendon, Don McElroy, Dr. Ken Rainwater, Kent Satterwhite, Aubrey Spear, and Jim Steiert.

There was a quorum of Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members in attendance (*17 of 21 voting members or 81% attendance*).

**Voting members unable to attend (excused absences):** Voting members unable to attend today's meeting were: Jack Campsey (*medical appointment*), Delmon Ellison Jr. (*farming*), Richard Leonard (*illness*), and John Taylor (*illness*).

**Voting members unable to attend (unexcused absences):** None.

**Non-voting members in attendance:** Non-voting members in attendance were Sarah Backhouse, Texas Water Development Board; John Clayton, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department; Amy Ewing, Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; and Jay Keith, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.

**Non-voting members unable to attend (excused absences):** Matt Williams, Texas Department of Agriculture.

**Others in attendance:** William Asquith, USGS-Lubbock; Lori Barnes, Llano Estacado UWCD; Ray Brady, Gateway UWCD; Adeline Fox, High Plains UWCD; Dr. Rodica Gelca, Texas Tech Climate Science Center; Lindy Harris, South Plains UWCD; Cleon Namken, USDA-NRCS; Beth Salvas, Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; Gary Shipp, TCEQ; and Jimmy Wedel, Texas Corn Producers Board. *(These names were obtained from a sign-in sheet in the A. Wayne Wyatt Board Room.)*

Carmon McCain of the High Plains Water District staff served as recording secretary for the meeting. Elaine Fowler with Cathy Sosebee and Associates took the transcript.

### **3. Introduction of New Members and Guests.**

Chairman Brown welcomed those in attendance at today's meeting.

### **ACTION ITEMS:**

#### **4. Discuss and take possible action to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2014 regular meeting.**

Draft minutes of the September 18, 2014 regular meeting were provided to the membership prior to today's meeting. There being no additions or corrections, a motion was made by Mayor Josserand and seconded by Mr. Kirkpatrick to approve the minutes as printed. All members voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.

#### **5. Discuss and take possible action to approve the financial report.**

A financial report was provided to the membership prior to today's meeting. Mr. Hutchison reported a balance of \$1,179.62 as of October 31, 2014. A motion to accept the financial report as presented was made by Mr. Coleman and seconded by Mr. McClendon. All members voted "aye" and the financial report was unanimously approved as presented.

**6. Discuss and take possible action to appoint James L. “Jimmy” Wedel as an additional voting member representing agriculture.**

Chairman Brown said a nomination packet for Mr. Wedel was submitted and distributed to the membership in advance of today's meeting in compliance with LERWPG By-Laws. A motion to appoint Mr. Wedel as an additional voting member representing agriculture was made by Mr. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Hopper. All members voted “aye,” and the motion was unanimously approved. Chairman Brown welcomed Mr. Wedel as a member of the regional water planning group.

**7. Discuss and take action to appoint an Officer Nominating Committee for 2015.**

Chairman Brown appointed Mayor Josserand as chairman of the officer nominating committee. Other members are Harvey Everheart and Kent Satterwhite. Each has agreed to serve in this capacity. They will give a report at the first meeting in 2015.

**8. Discuss and consider reappointment of LERWPG members whose term expires in 2014 to a five-year term expiring in 2019.**

Chairman Brown noted that Dr. Barnes, Mr. Blalack, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Harbin, Mr. Hutcheson, Mayor Josserand, Mr. Leonard, Mr. Spear, and Mr. Taylor all have terms expiring in 2014. He asked if these members were willing to continue service representing their respective water user groups.

Mr. Everheart said Richard Leonard told him that he did not wish to continue as an agriculture representative.

Mr. Harbin said he would be retiring from Lighthouse Electric Co-op in the future—but that he would continue as a member until a replacement is found to represent electrical generation.

All others indicated that they would continue service on the regional water planning group. Mr. McCain will contact Mr. Ellison and Mr. Taylor.

There being no other discussion or any objections, Chairman Brown reappointed Dr. Barnes, Mr. Blalack, Mr. Harbin, Mr. Hutcheson, Mayor Josserand, and Mr. Spear to five-year terms expiring in 2019.

**9. Discuss and take possible action to approve execution of TWDB Contract Amendment # 5 for Contract 1148301326.**

Chairman Brown called on Sarah Backhouse to discuss and take possible action to approve execution of Contract Amendment # 5 for Contract 1148301326. Ms. Backhouse's flight from Austin to Lubbock is delayed due to weather. Mayor Josserand asked Chairman Brown to skip this agenda item and revisit it once Ms. Backhouse arrives later in the meeting. There being no objections, Chairman Brown moved to the next agenda item.

**10. Discuss drought and drought indices for inclusion in the 2016 Llano Estacado Regional Water Management Plan.**

Chairman Brown called on Amy Ewing and Beth Salvas with Daniel B. Stephens and Associates to discuss drought and drought indices for inclusion in the 2016 Llano Estacado Regional Water Management Plan.

The information discussed in Agenda Item 10 will be presented in Chapter 7 of the 2016 regional water plan. This is a new requirement which focuses on drought and drought preparation.

Ms. Salvas began her discussion with a PowerPoint presentation, which included an overview of Region O Climate Divisions, Palmer Drought Severity Index classifications, historic Palmer Drought Severity Index for Texas Divisions 1 & 2 for the time period 1900 to 2013, and an overview of current reservoir storage for Lake Alan Henry, Lake Mackenzie, Lake Meredith, and White River Lake.

Ms. Salvas noted that the 2012 State Water Plan ranked droughts in each climate region according to intensity and duration. She said the drought of record in intensity and duration for the entire State of Texas is the one from 1950 to 1957.

For Climate Division 1, the drought from 1950 to 1957 also ranked number 1 in intensity and duration. The number 2 drought in intensity was from 1909 to 1911. The number 2 drought in duration was from 1962 to 1967. The number 3 drought in duration and intensity was from 1933 to 1936. The 2011 drought dipped well below anything previously seen in this climate division; however, it has not reached the duration of the 1950s drought at this time.

For Climate Division 2, the number 1 drought in intensity and duration is the drought from 1950 to 1957. The number 2 drought in intensity and duration is 1909 to 1913. The number 3 drought in intensity is 1916 to 1918. The number 3 drought in duration is 1963 to 1967. A similar situation in 2011 was seen within this climatic region.

Ms. Salvas also noted that the surface water modeling contains supply totals which begin in the 1940s and end before 2000. The surface water modeling does not take into account the last 14 years of data. She said it is important to keep this in mind when looking at some other values in the model.

Mr. Spear said the City of Lubbock has data through 2013, which includes more current information on Lake Alan Henry. He asked if the regional water planning group could use that information—instead of older data. She believed that it could be used. Ms. Ewing explained that TCEQ handles water availability modeling (WAMs) and that these data have not yet been updated.

After viewing slides pertaining to reservoir storage totals, Mr. Satterwhite asked why there were missing data for Lake Meredith. He said the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority (CRMWA) has these data. Ms. Salvas said she obtained these data from the Texas Water Development Board—and there was no explanation as to why these data were missing.

Mr. Satterwhite noted that future supply estimates are available for use in Region A. He suggested that the two regional water planning groups meet and share information with one another.

It was noted that recent rainfall has allowed water authorities to resume pumping from their surface water reservoirs. Several of these reservoirs were not planned or constructed until after the 1950s drought of record.

There being no other discussion, Chairman Brown called for the group to consider Agenda Item 11.

## **11. Discuss and consider a summary of the existing drought contingency plans and drought triggers.**

Ms. Salvas said DBS&A has requested drought contingency plans (DCPs) from municipalities and water supplies within the regional water planning group area. At present, 48 different DCPs have been received. These represent the majority of municipalities and water suppliers in Region O. Some groups are working to complete their DCPs in the near future.

The 2016 regional water plan will provide a summary of current triggers used to initiate DCPs in Region O. Did these triggers work? If not, feedback and comments will be greatly appreciated.

The 48 plans are similar since they are based upon TCEQ templates. However, most have five water shortage stages or conditions. These include Stage 1 as a mild drought; Stage 2 as a moderate drought; Stage 3 as a severe drought; Stage 4 as a critical drought; and Stage 5 as emergency conditions. A handful of communities in the region did include water allocation under extreme conditions.

The current trigger criteria are based upon system capacity, water demand volume, as well as water levels in their reservoir(s) and recovery or lack of recovery. In addition, other criteria are tied to wholesale water providers. If that person or entity initiates their drought response, then the water user group must automatically initiate their drought contingency plan as well.

In most plans, there are voluntary water use reductions in Stage 1 and some of Stage 2. This includes reduced irrigation/landscape watering, promotion of water conservation, and minimizing/discontinuing non-essential water use.

Mandatory restrictions are found in Stage 2 and above. This includes limiting irrigation and landscape watering, prohibiting non-essential water use, and increased restrictions in each stage.

Mr. Spear noted that Stage 1 is mandatory in the City of Lubbock. Ms. Salvias said she would update their table accordingly.

Ms. Salvias concluded discussion on this agenda item by asking for feedback from the regional water planning group members. She would like to know if any communities within Region O have documented demand reductions from implementing drought contingency plans. Did this work as planned? Did this work better or worse than expected? How can they be improved?

Chairman Brown asked if the consultant has visited with TCEQ regarding the matter. Ms. Salvias said both model draft plans have been submitted to the local TCEQ regional office for review/comment. However, the local TCEQ has not had enough time to provide comments before today's meeting. The TCEQ headquarters in Austin has not yet been contacted.

Mr. Spear offered some feedback regarding Stage 1 restrictions implemented by the City of Lubbock. When the City of Lubbock went into Stage 1 for the first time, there was a mandatory two days per week for landscape irrigation. However, the city did not designate which two days were to be used. After that, there were certain assigned days.

Use of even and odd street addresses did not work either. The City of Lubbock now uses the last digit of a street address. Watering is spread out over six days to allow different street addresses to water on certain days. One day is used as a “rest day.” The media has been helpful in letting residents know this schedule.

There being no other discussion, Chairman Brown called for the group to consider Agenda Item 12.

## **12. Discuss the draft model drought contingency plans developed by the consultant.**

Ms. Salvas reminded the group that draft model contingency plans have been developed by the consultant for use in the 2016 regional water plan. She would appreciate any feedback from the group regarding (1) drought triggers and responses; and (2) the draft plans for small retail public water suppliers (local groundwater source) and midsize retail water public water suppliers (groundwater and surface water sources).

She noted that each system is unique and different. The drought contingency plans must be tailored for each supplier since a “one size fits all” approach will not work in this case. The red text in the documents provided to members represents example text for use in preliminary discussion. These are optional and can be taken out in the example, if desired.

The example stages and goals are as follows:

- Stage 1 “Mild” is a 10% voluntary reduction.
- Stage 2 “Moderate” is a mandatory 25% reduction.
- Stage 3 “Severe” is a mandatory 50% reduction.
- Stage 4 “Critical” is a mandatory 75% reduction.
- Stage 5 “Emergency” is a mandatory 90% reduction.
- Stage 6 “Water Allocation” is optional.

Some of the example trigger criteria include:

- Daily water use exceeding X percent of the total system peak capacity for X consecutive days.
- Static water levels in the water supplier’s wells are equal to or less than X feet below the measuring point.
- Total daily water demand equals or exceeds X million gallons for X consecutive days or X million gallons on a single day.
- Treated water reservoir levels continue falling within refilling above X percent overnight.

Mr. Spear said that actual water usage during the summer months can be dramatically influenced by heat and rainfall. Each summer is different. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how much water is really saved by implementing drought restrictions since rainfall and heat also play a significant role in how much water is used daily. The City of Lubbock has moved from Stage 1 to Stage 2 and back to Stage 1 over the last few years based on drought triggers. However, each year has produced very different rainfall and heat patterns.

One possible trigger in the model could be set by determining the lowest level that a terminal storage reservoir level can reach and still refill overnight.

Mr. Spear said daily triggers for drought restrictions are not practical. One day does not provide enough information to determine whether a long-term problem exists in supplying water to a system. For example, the City of Lubbock uses five to 10 days before action is taken with regard to a trigger that has been reached. He believes a five to 10 day period is more realistic to avoid “knee-jerk” reactions.

A recommendation of triggers and actions to be taken in drought for each water source in the region will also be developed for Chapter 7. This will also identify all the entities that rely on each water source and how that source is managed.

A number of drought stages will have to be determined as well as the the restrictions associated with each stage. There must be a minimum of one severe stage and two critical emergency conditions.

These will all be included as a part of Chapter 7, which the consultant hopes to have completed in draft form for the next LERWPG meeting. Again, both Ms. Ewing and Ms. Salvas encourage feedback from the regional water planning group members regarding the draft document.

The goal of the model drought contingency plans is to have a regional example for municipalities in the region to use—rather than using an older template provided on a statewide basis through TCEQ. These examples are being offered as a resource to assist communities and entities on what they need to do in times of drought. However, each City is responsible for developing and adopting a plan that the TCEQ will approve.

Mr. Coleman asked Ms. Salvas how persons in the region will know that a new document is available for downloading. She suggested making it available on the LERWPG web site. Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested that more education is needed regarding the regional water planning group and resources such as this. Perhaps better dialogue is needed between municipalities and the regional water planning group. He noted that many communities did not have drought contingency plans or backup water supplies until they were “slapped in the face by the drought.”

Chairman Brown commended Ms. Ewing and Ms. Salvas on their presentation.

### **13. Discuss the partial draft of Chapter 3 of the Initially-Prepared Plan.**

Ms. Ewing told the group to contact her if they have any comments or revisions regarding the partial draft of Chapter 3. This chapter will discuss water availability, existing water supplies, and water availability.

### **9. (REVISITED) Discuss and take possible action to approve execution of TWDB Contract Amendment # 5 for Contract 1148301326.**

Ms. Backhouse apologized for the flight delay which prevented her from arriving on time for today’s meeting.

There has been a delay in the contract amendments to all of the regional water planning groups so a copy of the amendment was not available for the meeting. The water management strategies module will not be ready in January/February as expected, and the release has been pushed back to April—just prior to the due date of the Initially Prepared Plan (IPP).

The due date of the final plan to the TWDB has been moved from Nov. 2, 2015 to Dec. 1, 2015. There is a requirement in the contract that all data entry must be completed by the time the IPP is submitted. Because of the water management strategy module delay, TWDB is changing the contract to require all water management strategy data entry be completed by July 1—so that consultants will not have to complete this task in just one month’s time.

Other contract amendments include adjusting the scope of work to remove the 2016 plan draft project prioritization list, a change to the expense budget for taskss 12 and13 to allow money to be moved between those two tasks, additional timeline changes including final reimbursement date and expiration date for the contract, as well as some “clean-up” language.

Ms. Backhouse said the final contract amendment document should be available after Thanksgiving. She said it would agreeable to the TWDB if the RWPG membership gave the Region O administrator permission to execute the contract when it arrives. Another option would be to allow the Region O executive committee to review the amendment before allowing the Region O administrator to execute the contract amendment.

After brief discussion, Mr. McElroy made a motion to allow the Region O administrator (*HPWD General Manager Jason Coleman*) to execute the contract amendment upon arrival from the TWDB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Everheart. All members voted “aye” and the motion was unanimously approved.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS AND OTHER INFORMATION:**

### **14. Receive A Report From The TWDB Project Manager.**

Ms. Backhouse shared a working schedule for the 2016 regional water plan with the membership. She noted that the regional water planning group consultants will have training on how to structure data for inclusion in the water management strategy database.

There will be a couple of “placeholders” in the IPP due to the delay in the water management strategy module.

The House Bill 4 stakeholder committee will meet Jan. 13-14 in Austin to discuss uniform standards for adopting the prioritizations for the 2016 projects. There should be an update from that meeting, depending upon the date of the next LERWPG meeting.

Mr. Spear, who represents Region O on the committee, said the group is meeting to determine if there are any major concerns with the current adopted uniform standards. If so, revisions need to be determined—so that they can be made as soon as possible.

Ms. Backhouse noted that the TWDB is initiating the fifth round of regional water planning contracts. This action starts before completion of the current plan—since the funding is on a biennial basis. It does not necessarily coincide with the five-year water planning cycles. The regional water planning group will need to take action on the regional water planning contract prior to March 3, 2015.

Based upon discussion at previous meetings, the LERWPG will need to either reaffirm HPWD as the local political subdivision administering Region O for the fifth round of water planning or select a new political subdivision, such as the South Plains Association of Governments (SPAG), to take its place. Another action is to authorize the political subdivision to post the public notice and apply for funds from the TWDB for the fifth round of water planning.

She said HPWD could go ahead and resubmit an application—and then switch out once a new political subdivision agrees to take on responsibilities. This can be accomplished through a simple TWDB contract amendment to transfer responsibilities signed by both HPWD and the new political subdivision.

Ms. Backhouse then gave a brief PowerPoint presentation outlining the State Water Implementation Fund for Texas (SWIFT). She told the group that Ms. Lee Huntoon is the TWDB staff member managing Regional Project Implementation Team # 1, which includes Region A, E, F, and O. She is the main point contact for questions regarding SWIFT. Mr. Spear suggested that Ms. Huntoon attend a future Region O meeting in order to meet the membership.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked Ms. Backhouse if she had an idea of the number of political subdivisions and agricultural organizations in Region O that plan to apply for SWIFT funding. Ms. Backhouse said she was not aware of any responses as yet. Ms. Huntoon would be better suited to answer the question.

#### **15. Receive A Report from the Region O Technical Consultant.**

Ms. Ewing had no additional comments.

#### **16. Receive A Report from the Region O Administrator.**

Mr. Coleman said he and Mr. Spear had visited with Tim Pierce, executive director of SPAG, to gauge the agency's interest in taking over administration of the regional water planning group. Both shared information about the funding mechanism used by the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission (PRPC) for Region A. SPAG is still looking into this.

## **17. Receive A Report From The GMA # 2 And GMA # 6 Representatives.**

Mr. Hopper told the group that Groundwater Management Area # 2 met in Seminole on Oct. 23, 2014. Their next meeting is Dec. 17 in Stanton. Topics for discussion at the December meeting include: requests for proposals for technical assistance with joint planning, and discussion with TWDB staff on methods to change the GMA 2 and GMA 6 boundary between Briscoe and Hall Counties.

No report was given concerning GMA # 6 due to Mr. Campsey's absence.

## **18. Receive reports from liaisons to other regional water planning groups.**

**Region A:** Mr. Satterwhite said Region A met Nov. 5, 2014. The group reaffirmed the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission as its political subdivision. Other items of business included a review of water availability numbers for other aquifers within the region, a review of the strategy for development of agricultural water conservation strategies and municipal water conservation strategies, and review of the IPP's draft chapters 2, 3, and 4.

**Region B:** No report was given due to Mr. Campsey's absence.

**Region F:** Mr. Everheart said Region F met Nov. 20, 2014. Both Region F and Region O are moving forward at the same pace. His only concern is with the change in timelines. Region F has scheduled its meetings for the remainder of the planning cycle.

**Region G:** Mr. McClendon said Region G met Nov. 5 as well. He said there was some interesting discussion relating to the San Antonio Water System's (SAWS) purchase of groundwater from Burleson County. This sets up a potential conflict between Regions G and L which may require intervention by the TWDB.

## **19. Receive Public Input & Comments To The Regional Water Planning Group.**

Chairman Brown called for public input and comments. No public input or comments were offered.

**20. Consider A Date And Agenda Items For The Next Regular Meeting.**

After discussion, the next regular meeting of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group is 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 27, 2015 at the HPWD Office.

**21. Consider Other Business And Announcements.**

Chairman Brown called on the membership to consider other business and announcements. There being none, no action was taken.

**22. Adjournment.**

There being no additional business, Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

---

The above conveys my understanding of the issues discussed and conclusions reached. I assume this understanding is correct until notice to the contrary is received.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Doug Hutcheson*

-----  
**Doug Hutcheson, Secretary-Treasurer**  
Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group

*These minutes were approved at the January 27, 2015 regular meeting of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group.*