

Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

10:00 A.M., April 23, 2014

HPWD Office, 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 and the regional water planning group web site at 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 (Bo) Brown Jr.; Jack Campsey; Jason Coleman; Harvey Everheart; Tom Fulton; Bill Harbin; Ronnie Hopper; Doug Hutcheson; Bob Josserand; Mark Kirkpatrick; Richard Leonard; Don McElroy; Dr. Ken Rainwater; Kent Satterwhite; Aubrey Spear; and Jim Steiert.

The following non-voting members were in attendance: Sarah Backhouse; Andy Donnelly; and Matt Williams.

Unable to attend (excused absences): Those unable to attend today's meeting were: Delaine Baucum; Judge Mike DeLoach; Delmon Ellison Jr.; Richard Gillespie; Michael McClendon; and John Taylor. Non-voting members unable to attend were John Clayton and Malcolm Laing.

Absent members (unexcused absences): None.

There was a quorum of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members in attendance (*18 of 24 voting members or 75% attendance*).

Others in attendance:

Kelly Baker, City of Lubbock; Neil Blandford, Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; Amy Crowell, Mesquite GCD; Amy Ewing, Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; Rex Isom, Executive Director, Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Districts; Mark Hall, USDA-NRCS; Ryan Kennerly, Parkhill, Smith and Cooper; Jeramy Kitchen, Office of Rep. John Frullo; Layne Marlow, South Plains UWCD; Russell Martin; David R. Miller; Temple McKinnon, TWDB; Cleon Namken, USDA-NRCS; James Powell, High Plains UWCD; Stephanie Pruitt, Texas Corn Producers Board; Erik Rejino, City of Levelland; Darren Richardson, USDA-NRCS; Joel Riedel, Office of Senator Robert Duncan; Pat Riley; Greg Stanton, USGS; Brandt Underwood, USDA-NRCS; Aaron Wendt, Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board; Van Wilson; and Linda York, Cathy Sosebee and Associates. (*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.

3. Introduction of New Members and Guests.

Chairman Brown introduced Sarah Backhouse with the Texas Water Development Board. Ms. Backhouse is the new project manager for Region O. She succeeds Doug Shaw, who is now serving as the TWDB's rural ombudsman.

Chairman Brown then asked those in the audience to stand and introduce themselves.

ACTION ITEMS:

4. Discuss and Take Possible Action to Approve the January 16, 2014 regular meeting minutes.

The minutes of the January 16, 2014 regular meeting were provided to members by e-mail/regular mail for review prior to today's meeting. There being no addition or correction, a motion was made by Mayor Bob Josserand and seconded by Mark Kirkpatrick that the minutes of the January 16, 2014 LERWPG meeting be approved as printed. **All voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.**

5. Discuss and Take Possible Action To Approve the Financial Report.

The Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group financial report was provided to members by e-mail/regular mail for review prior to today's meeting. Secretary-Treasurer Doug Hutcheson reported a balance of \$93,212.53 as of March 31, 2014. A motion to accept the report as presented was made by Harvey Everheart and seconded by Kent Satterwhite. **All voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.**

6. Discuss and Take Action to Accept the Resignation of Judge James M. ("Mike") DeLoach as the County Government Representative.

Chairman Brown stated that Judge James M. ("Mike") DeLoach submitted a letter of resignation on Jan. 16, 2014. A copy of the letter was presented to members for review prior to today's meeting. In his letter, Judge DeLoach stated "... I do not believe I have the time to do the group justice and still take care of my responsibilities to Lamb County...I do believe the work you do is important to our area; however, I believe that someone else might be able to contribute more than I can at this time..." A motion to accept Judge DeLoach's resignation was made by Don McElroy and seconded by Mayor Josserand. **All voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.**

7. Discuss and Take Action to Accept the Resignation of Delaine Baucum as an Agriculture Representative.

Chairman Brown stated that Delaine Baucum submitted a letter of resignation on April 2, 2014. A copy of the letter was presented to members for review prior to today's meeting. In her letter, Mrs. Baucum said she was resigning "as I am not able to serve at this time." A motion to accept Mrs. Baucum's resignation was made by Ronnie Hopper and seconded by Mr. Kirkpatrick. **All voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Mrs. Baucum has served as a member of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group since 1998.

Mayor Josserand said it would be appropriate if the group adopted a proclamation or sent a thank you letter honoring Mrs. Baucum for her dedicated service. Mr. McCain said a thank you letter from the LERWPG was written and was signed by Chairman Brown at the start of today's meeting.

After discussion, Mayor Josserand made a motion that a Resolution of Appreciation be drafted and presented to Mrs. Baucum in recognition of her dedicated service to the regional water planning group. Bill Harbin seconded the motion. **All voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.**

8. Receive a Report of the Draft 2011 Region O Strategy Prioritization, Request Authorization for the Consultant and Water Management Strategies Subcommittee to Work to Address Any Comments Received, and Request Approval for Submission to the TWDB by June 1.

Chairman Brown asked Aubrey Spear, chairman of the Water Management Strategies Subcommittee, for an update.

Mr. Spear said the subcommittee, along with the LERWPG technical consultants, is working on the prioritization of the projects in Region O as required by the TWDB and the HB 4 process.

Mr. Spear visited with TWDB Director Bech Bruun about this. Director Bruun said that the prioritization of projects is just one of the ways that funding is available from the TWDB. The SWIFT fund has gotten all the attention since \$2 billion was allocated for the purpose of low-interest loans from the Rainy Day fund. Mr. Spear said that the prioritization is one of the mechanisms available. It is important to remind everyone that just because certain projects don't receive as high a ranking as others—it doesn't mean that they're not going to be eligible for other types of state water funding.

Mr. Spear also added that HB 4 lists the items that have to be prioritized. The TWDB will take the Region O prioritized projects and give them a second priority rating. He believes that this prioritization exercise will be helpful as the group moves forward with the current plan.

Mr. Spear asked Ms. Amy Ewing with Daniel B. Stephens and Associates to explain the draft prioritization scores to date.

Ms. Ewing presented a table with the draft scores to date. This is the same template that the other 15 regional water planning groups are using. She noted that the draft scores are due to the TWDB by June 1. The regional water planning group will discuss efforts to date and will consider approval to submit a draft score to the TWDB. After that, Region O will receive feedback and will have an opportunity to revise the drafts. Final scoring of the 2011 projects is due to the TWDB on September 1, 2014.

Ms. Ewing offered the following comments regarding scoring:

- There were 78 projects in the 2011 Region O plan. Much of the data used in the prioritizations came directly from the 2011 plan. Much of the scoring was fairly straightforward and all assumptions that were made have been documented and will be turned into the TWDB along with the draft prioritization scores. The technical consultant has met with the water management strategy subcommittee to review and obtain feedback.
- Criterion One is the Decade of Need. This is 40 percent of the total score. The information used to score Uniform Standards 1A and 1B came directly from the DB12 database from the TWDB.
- Criterion Two is the project feasibility. This is 10 percent of the total score. There was considerable discussion regarding this. Uniform Standard 2A asks what supporting data are available to show that the quantity of water is available. It was decided to give the conservation projects full points because water is always available for conservation. Uniform Standard 2C relates to the level of project engineering and/or planning has been accomplished. This standard applies more toward municipal projects. It was decided that both conservation and agricultural irrigation projects would be assigned a 9 out of 10 points. In the event that the sponsor has a conservation plan or strategy in place as discussed in the previous plan, then they were assigned a full 10 points.
- She noted that in Uniform Standard 2D, it does not require the project sponsor to provide a written request for the project to be included in the 2011 regional water plan. The written request must be provided by the sponsor in order to obtain points for this standard when the 2016 plan projects are prioritized.
- Criterion Three is project viability. This is 25 percent of the total score. This relates to the decade that the project's supply comes on line and what percent of the needs are satisfied by the project. Uniform Standard 3C asks if the strategy being scored is the only economically feasible source of new water—other than conservation. This is a yes/no question and was derived from feedback from the committee.
- Criterion Four is the project sustainability. This is 15 percent of the total score. This determines how long the project is expected to provide water—as well as the amount of volume that the water supply is expected to change during the life of the project. This information was derived from the last planning process.

- Criterion Five is cost-effectiveness. This is 10 percent of the total score. The sole uniform standard is the expected unit cost of water as compared to the median unit cost of other strategies in the current plan. We calculated what the median cost was and compared it to the cost data provided by the TWDB.

Mr. Spear thanked Ms. Ewing for her report. He noted that 20 percent of the SWIFT funds are set aside for water conservation projects and 10 percent set aside for rural projects. Some of these projects listed will be pulled out and considered as part of this set aside, as well.

Ms. Backhouse said the deadline of June 1, 2014 is on a Sunday. Because of this, the TWDB is requesting the regional water planning groups to submit these data by close of business on Friday, May 30th.

Mr. Spear asked Ms. McKinnon if the TWDB has developed criteria on how much the regional water planning groups' prioritizations will be weighted compared to the TWDB's prioritization of the same projects.

Ms. McKinnon said the TWDB is still working to get a set of draft rules released in June with the goal of having final rules adopted in December. The first set of draft rules will provide insight into how the regional prioritizations will be weighted as well as the first definitions of what is considered to be a conservation and a rural project. These were among several hot topics of discussion at previous stakeholder meetings.

Mr. Spear said it may be a year before the final prioritization of projects is completed. Ms. McKinnon agreed and said that the first date that funds can be disbursed under SWIFT is March 2015.

Mr. Spear said looking at the available funds, there are projects that can be funded. The question is whether or not the individual sponsor wants to go through that funding mechanism or find other funds that may be more attractive, such as low interest loans for smaller communities.

Mr. McElroy asked how the LERWPG's final score would influence the state's final score or ranking. Ms. McKinnon said she could not answer that since she is not part of the TWDB's team working on that specific aspect of the rulemaking process. She will know more after June 1, 2014. Chairman Brown asked Ms. Ewing to address the sponsorship issue. She said that this received considerable discussion in the subcommittee. There is some concern about the agricultural irrigation strategies and who might be the sponsor for such projects. The sponsor must be a political subdivision of the state. She attended a meeting of the agricultural subcommittee for the Panhandle Regional Water Planning Group ("Region A") where the prioritization/irrigation strategies were being discussed. It was decided that the groundwater conservation districts will be the sponsors in Region A. Many of the GCDs are already participating in an existing low-interest loan conservation program.

Chairman Brown said the low-interest loan program sounds good—but the down side is the sponsor can be left holding the bag if there is a default on the loan. The sponsor must step forward and say they are willing to enter into a loan agreement. Individual farmers cannot apply unless a sponsor agrees to it.

A motion was made by Mr. Coleman and seconded by Mr. Kirkpatrick to approve the draft prioritization of Region O projects contained in the 2011 plan as presented.

Chairman Brown called for discussion. Mr. Spear said the document would be submitted to the TWDB as a draft—subject to modifications. Ms. McKinnon said it would be wise to craft the motion to give the technical consultants and the LERWPG Executive Committee and Water Management Strategies subcommittee latitude to address any feedback received and make modifications as needed.

Chairman Brown noted that this is a draft document that will be submitted to the TWDB. They will review it and make suggested recommendations. The response from the TWDB is highest importance. He asked Ms. McKinnon if an entity, such as White River Municipal Water District, could make changes after the response is received from the TWDB.

Ms. McKinnon said that the prioritization is submitted by the regional water planning group. It is appropriate for the entity to review the prioritization; however, these are uniform standards that must be applied. The planning groups are being asked to submit concerns that they have about the standards which have been developed and identify problems with assumptions or methodology. She said that project rankings cannot be subjectively changed—because they are still bound by the parameters of these uniform standards.

There being no additional discussion, Chairman Brown asked Mr. Coleman and Mr. Kirkpatrick if they would accept this amendment to their original motion and second. Both agreed to the amendment. Chairman Brown called for the question. **All voted “aye,” and the motion was unanimously approved.**

9. Receive a Report/Presentation on the Updated Identified Water Needs.

Ms. Ewing called the planning group's attention to a five-page table listing the various water user groups where water supply (provided by WUGs) exceeds the TWDB's water availability estimates. The water supply values have been updated based upon surveys and follow-up calls in the region.

A technical memorandum is due to the TWDB on August 1, so the final memorandum will be presented for discussion at a summer meeting of the LERWPG.

Ms. Ewing said the technical consultants are seeking guidance from the LERWPG membership on how to adjust the water supply estimates to match the TWDB's water availability estimates. At present, the full municipal water supply estimates in a county are deducted from the water availability estimates for that county. The remaining water availability in the county is proportionately distributed among livestock, mining, manufacturing, and steam-electric. This forces the supply and availability estimates to match for each county. She said the question is “should we not take the municipal supply out before we proportionately decrease supplies?” There are 36 towns listed—should they share proportionately with other WUGs in water supply reductions or should reductions be calculated another way?

Dr. Rainwater noted that the municipalities were asked about their water supply estimate for a 50-year planning period. This is based on their evaluation—and doesn't have to match availability estimates. He said that this demonstrates a communication disconnect in that communities think they have an adequate water supply while TWDB water availability models say they don't.

Mr. Donnelly noted that GMA # 2 initiated their desired future conditions in 2010. The TWDB developed managed available groundwater (MAGs) based on the DFCs. Those MAGs are now the availabilities that this group is required to use. The cumulative water supplies for each county must match the modeled availabilities provided by the state. There can't be a supply that is greater than the availabilities.

Considerable discussion followed:

- Ms. McKinnon stated that districts have to manage their aquifers to meet the DFC and the MAGs are a quantified number of what that statement is. For planning purposes, the TWDB is making sure plans are consistent with DFCs by treating MAGs as a ceiling. Future supplies or future strategies can't exceed that MAG. The GCDs must manage what the DFC is.
- Mr. Coleman reviewed a specific example included in the table, "Region O Water User Groups with Water Supply Greater than Water Availability." There are four water user groups in the section, "Source Ogallala in Castro County and Red River Basin." Mr. Coleman noted that this document shows the four groups (*County-other, irrigation, livestock, and manufacturing*) to have water supply greater than availability. He wonders how these data were determined.
- Ms. McKinnon said each of the regional water planning groups across the state is working through this process. They are trying to determine if everyone is going to share in the pain of the estimated or modeled shortage that exists or if a priority-use scheme should be used. If this is just on the current supply side—then there may be a need to develop a strategy to address this.
- There was some discussion about substituting the term "availability" with "supply" and "demand" with "need." Mr. Donnelly said these are all terms that have a specific meaning in the water planning process. There will be problems if the terms are flipped around.
- Ms. McKinnon noted the following definitions in the TWDB Planning Document:
 - Existing water supply is the maximum amount of water available from existing sources for use during drought of record conditions that is physically and legally available for use by a water user group. A water user group is a category that the group must plan for.
 - Availability is the maximum amount of water available from source during a drought of record regardless of whether the supply is physically or legally available to water user groups. It's the bathtub of water.

- Mayor Josserand expressed his frustration with the terminology. He said the LERWPG wants to understand water demand versus availability. In his opinion, it shouldn't be difficult to delineate the groups that will get water and the proportion they will receive.
- Ms. Ewing said this exercise is to derive supply estimates and compare them to demand estimates to identify needs. The difference between the supply estimates and the demand estimates determines what the needs are for each WUG. The need will be used to determine what supply strategies need to be implemented to eliminate any water supply shortages.
- Mr. Harbin noted that some municipalities may have estimated or reported a supply in excess of availability. If the planning group doesn't recognize that they may have erred in reporting—then the municipality may not be recognized as having shortages. They might not receive as high of a SWIFT funding prioritization if the plan does not demonstrate that they have a need in the closest decade. Reducing supply estimates for municipalities to match the TWDB's availability estimates will assist them in demonstrating that they have a need sooner. This could be problematic for the planning group in the future.

After some additional discussion, Dr. Rainwater made a motion to evenly divide the estimated shortages among the water user groups. Dr. Barnes seconded the motion. **The vote was 17 in favor and 1 against. The motion was approved.**

Ms. Ewing said this will be presented at the next LERWPG meeting, which will be in advance of August 1.

10. Receive an Update on the Progress of Chapter 7 (“Drought Management”) of the 2016 Llano Estacado Regional Water Management Plan.

Ms. Ewing said this is a new Chapter in the 2016 regional water management plan. It requires drought contingency plans from all the water user groups in Region O. At present, 28 of the plans have been received and Daniel B. Stephens is working to obtain the rest. Mayor Josserand asked about the water user group surveys. Ms. Ewing said there were four surveys that had not been submitted at the time of the last Region O meeting. They are working to obtain this information. She noted that some of the information in the surveys was provided about a year or so ago—and will need updating.

RECESS FOR LUNCH

Chairman Brown recessed the meeting at 11:20 a.m. for lunch.

RECONVENE MEETING

Chairman Brown reconvened the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

11. Hear a Presentation from the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board Regarding its Brush Management Program.

Chairman Brown introduced Aaron Wendt with the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board. Mr. Wendt also introduced TSSWCB Executive Director Rex Isom of Idalou.

For the past 75 years, the agency has worked with private landowners to implement conservation practices following the aftermath of the Dust Bowl. TSSWCB works closely with the 216 local soil and water conservation districts in Texas. The agency has responsibilities in water pollution management, working with farmers/ranchers to reduce water pollution from farm/ranchland, and water supply enhancement. In addition, TSSWCB works to maintain the 2,000 flood control dams in Texas as well as managing the Texas Invasive Species Coordinated Committee.

Noxious brush (*juniper and salt cedar*) has invaded millions of acres of land/rangeland across Texas. As a result, it has negatively impacted stream flow and aquifer recharge.

As a result of House Bill 1808 (*Sunset Provision*), the former Brush Control program was terminated and replaced with the water supply enhancement program in 2011. In order to implement the new program, a stakeholder committee and science advisory committee were formed. Dr. Rainwater serves on both committees.

Brush control has positive benefits, such as controlling invasive species, improving soil conditions, improving water quality, helping wildlife habitat, and preventing runoff which can contribute to water pollution.

TSSWCB has completed feasibility studies for the watersheds of Lake Kemp, Lake J.B. Thomas, Lake Meredith, and the Canadian River.

An in-progress feasibility study includes Lake Alan Henry. The USGS is conducting the study and associated modeling. The majority of funding comes from the City of Lubbock. Brush varieties being investigated are salt cedar and mesquite. The preliminary result on the amount of water that could be increased by brush control in the Lake Alan Henry watershed is expected later this year. The final study is due two years from now.

There is interest in new studies for the upper Brazos River above Lake Possum Kingdom as well as studies for Buffalo Springs Lake and White River Lake.

Methods of brush control vary by the brush species. It may be root plowing and chemical spray in Central Texas or use of leaf beetles and other biological control in other areas.

Approximately \$350,000 in brush control funding was allocated to the Panhandle South Plains region last year.

Mr. Satterwhite gave a brief overview of the brush control program administered by the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority in the Lake Meredith watershed. They have spent about \$3 million for helicopter spraying and use of beetles.

Region O has included brush control as one of its management strategies for several years.

Chairman Brown thanked Mr. Wendt for the presentation.

12. Receive a Report/Presentation from the Texas Alliance for Water Conservation regarding its Demonstration Project in Floyd and Hale Counties.

Chairman Brown welcomed Dr. Charles ("Chuck") West, Thornton Distinguished Chair of Plant and Soil Science, and Rick Kellison, TAWC Project Manager, with Texas Tech University's Department of Plant and Soil Science.

Dr. West gave a brief overview of the Texas Alliance for Water Conservation (TAWC) project. It was funded by the TWDB in 2004 and has been collecting data for the past nine years. One of the unique aspects of this project is that it is administered by a 9-10 member producer board.

The objective of the demonstration project is to show how agricultural producers can reduce total water use while maintaining or enhancing their profitability. It is important to sustain irrigated agriculture in the region for as long as possible. The project is working to identify the most effective and efficient cropping and irrigation systems.

Originally started in Floyd and Hale Counties, the program has expanded to include other counties in the region. On-farm monitoring of rainfall, soil temperature, water application, and other input data is a key component of the program. Economic analysis is another key component as researchers strive to get a better view of the cost of irrigation as well as the efficiency of water use in terms of the amount of crop produced and amount of net return per amount of water applied.

Dr. West also noted that the TAWC has developed some online management tools that producers can use to aid with their crop management decisions.

One is a resource allocation analyzer that producers can use prior to the cropping season to determine which crops should be grown based upon water availability, estimated input cost, and estimated crop value.

The second is an in-season planning tool that allows producers to schedule irrigation based upon rainfall received and evapotranspiration (ET) rates. This helps prevent over-irrigating and under-irrigating. It will help match the most efficient use of water with the best return in economics.

Funding for the project has been extended for the next five growing seasons.

Dr. West then introduced Mr. Kellison, who gave an overview of the outreach programs associated with the TAWC demonstration project.

Multiple field demonstration days were held in the past. However in 2013, the TAWC took a new approach with field walks at a specific farm to demonstrate technologies to producers. They could observe a specific conservation technique without incurring the cost to do so. This is not to say one technology is better than another—but to be able to demonstrate a wide range of technologies to the producer.

Kellison said the first field walks demonstrated LEPA center pivot irrigation and drip irrigation on corn, cotton, and grain sorghum. Each of the three companies (*John Deere*, *AquaSpy*, and *AquaCheck*) that sell soil moisture monitoring devices was invited to have one unit in each of the fields. Mr. Bob Glodt and Dr. Dan Krieg assisted with the soil moisture demonstrations. Mr. Jim Bordovsky of Texas A&M provided technical information at a March 2014 workshop on irrigation. There were about 21-26 producers in attendance at each field walk.

Additional work is underway to improve the various technologies--including ET scheduling that uses field-specific information derived from satellite remote sensing, rather than relying solely on a distant weather station. The technology will give a producer a more accurate view of the amount of water used on a particular field. The scheduler will be widely available at **tawcsolutions.org** next year at no cost.

Chairman Brown said four persons from the regional water planning group have seen these technologies in use. He said this should be included as one of the strategies in the regional water management plan.

After questions, Chairman Brown thanked Dr. West and Mr. Kellison for their presentation.

**13. Receive a Report from the TWDB Project Manager for Region O
(Sarah Backhouse/Temple McKinnon).**

Ms. Backhouse again emphasized that the draft strategy prioritization is due to the TWDB by the close of business on Friday, May 30th.

She added that the TWDB regional water planning group staff plans to send a memo to the TWDB leadership outlining some issues that the regional water planning groups have brought to their attention regarding implementation of the standards. It is hoped that some guidance can be provided to the RWPGs after June 1.

The technical memorandum is due August 1. Also, the initially prepared regional water plan is due May 1, 2015.

She concluded by mentioning that the TWDB has launched an interactive web-based version of the 2012 State Water Plan. The water needs are all that is currently available on-line; however additional updates will include population and demand projections as well as water management strategies. It is available for access on the TWDB's main web site or directly at www.texasstatewaterplan.org.

**14. Receive a Report from the LERWPG Technical Consultant
(Andy Donnelly/Amy Ewing).**

Ms. Ewing reminded the group of discussion at the previous meeting relating to surveys from municipalities that were yielding different information than what the models were yielding. There was discussion of sending a letter to the TWDB outlining just a couple of instances for their information. A draft letter was provided to the LERWPG members for review in advance of today's meeting.

There being no objection, Chairman Brown signed the letter. The original will be hand-delivered to Ms. Backhouse immediately following today's meeting.

15. Receive a Report from the LERWPG Administrator (Jason Coleman).

Mr. Coleman had nothing to report at this time.

16. Receive a Report on the April 1 2014 RWPG Chairs Conference Call.

Chairman Brown had nothing to report as he was unable to participate in the call.

**17. Receive a Report from the GMA # 2 and GMA # 6 representatives
(Ronnie Hopper and Jack Campsey).**

Mr. Hopper had nothing to report from Groundwater Management Area # 2.

Mr. Campsey said Groundwater Management Area # 6 met January 29, 2014. Highlights of the meeting included: presentations from three of six districts, a presentation from Rima Petrossian with the Texas Water Development Board, and a presentation of water level management from Raymond Brady, GMA # 6 geologist. Amy Crowell was reappointed as the representative to Region A. Jack Campsey was reappointed as the representative to Regions B and O. Mike McGuire was reappointed as Brazos G representative.

Mr. Campsey noted that Wichita Falls has about a 120-day water supply and Seymour has a 90-day water supply. Mike McGuire is attending today's Region B meeting in place of Mr. Campsey—since water hauling is expected to be discussed. Wichita Falls is already recycling their water.

**18. Receive Reports from Liaisons to Other Regional Water Planning Groups:
Regions A, B, F, and G.**

Region A: Mr. Satterwhite reported that Region A is at about the same planning stage as Region O. They will meet May 20, 2014 to discuss prioritization.

Region B: This was included in Mr. Campsey's earlier report.

Region F: No report given.

Region G: No report given.

19. Receive Public Input and Comments to the Regional Water Planning Group.

No public comment was received.

20. Consider a date and agenda items for the next regular meeting.

Ms. Ewing suggested a June meeting in order to meet the August 1, 2014 deadline for submitting the technical memorandum. After discussion, the consensus is to meet at **10:00 a.m., Thursday, June 19, 2014** at the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1 office.

Chairman Brown reminded the group that the LERWPG needs to find candidates to fill vacancies in the agriculture position and the county government position. He encouraged the group to think about possible nominees between now and the June 19, 2014 meeting.

21. Adjournment.

There being no additional business, Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 1:49 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,

Doug Hutcheson
Secretary-Treasurer
Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group

These minutes were approved at the June 19, 2014 regular meeting of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group.