

**MINUTES OF THE
LLANO ESTACADO REGIONAL WATER PLANNING GROUP (REGION O)
Thursday, August 1, 2013**

1. Call to order and welcome.

Sherry Stephens called the meeting to order at 10:00 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.

On July 18, 2013, notice was posted on the Secretary of State's website, the Region O website and the HPWD website; notice was provided to all Region O members, all county clerks within the Region O planning area, all regional planning group chairmen and other interested parties; and on July 29, 2013 meeting materials were emailed to all Region O members, posted on the Region O website and a hard copy was made available at the HPWD office.

2. Roll Call to establish a quorum.

The following Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members were in attendance: Melanie Barnes, Delaine Baucum, Bruce Blalack, Jack Campsey, Mike DeLoach, Delmon Ellison, Harvey Everheart, Bill Harbin, Mark Kirkpatrick, Richard Leonard, Mike McClendon, Don McElroy, Kent Satterwhite, Aubrey Spear, Jim Steiert, and John Taylor. A quorum was established.

Unable to Attend (Excused Absence): H.P. Brown, Doug Hutcheson, Richard Gillespie, Bob Josserand, and Ken Rainwater

Absent Members (Unexcused):

Non-Voting Members in Attendance: Doug Shaw (TWDB) and Sara Eatman (DBS&A).

Others in Attendance: Sherry Stephens (Region O Administrator), Neil Blandford (DBS&A), Kevin Hopson (DBS&A), David Harkins (RPS Espey), Yun Cho (TWDB), Linda York (Cathy Sosebee & Associates), Ben Weinheimer (TCFA), Jason Coleman (SPUWCD), Lori Barnes (LEUWCD), Greg Stanton (USGS), and Kelly Baker (City of Lubbock)

3. Introduce new members and visitors.

Mr. Spear introduced Neil Blandford and Kevin Hopson from Daniel B. Stephens & Associates (DBS&A). Mr. Spear asked Mr. Blandford to explain how DBS&A is going to address the vacancy left by the departure of Stefan Schuster.

Mr. Blandford began by assuring the planning group that DBS&A had already addressed the issue and a new team has been assembled. He handed out an updated organization chart that included the biographies of the staff that will be involved.

Andy Donnelly, who was unable to attend this meeting, will serve as the Region O project manager. Mr. Donnelly is a groundwater hydrologist and has been consulting for 20 years. He worked for the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) for three years and has been with DBS&A for five. He is a groundwater hydrologist knowledgeable in groundwater resources, groundwater models, the Desired Future Conditions (DFCs) process, Managed Available Groundwater (MAG), and all type of information and analysis that works into the planning process. He worked across the state when he was with the TWDB. He's been intimately involved with at least ten groundwater management areas and their associated regional water planning groups.

Mr. Blandford will serves as the principal in charge for the project. While he works from Albuquerque, he completed the original Southern High Plains Water Availability Model, the subsequent update that included the Edwards-Trinity, and has several other clients in this region.

Mr. Blandford mentioned that the one skill set that Stefan Schuster had that DBS&A cannot yet replace is Mr. Schuster's experience and knowledge of the regional planning process. They will fill this gap by relying on guidance from the TWDB, especially Doug Shaw, and their sub-consultants, particularly David Harkins, Espey Consultants.

4. Discuss and take possible action to approve the June 27, 2013 regular meeting minutes.

Mr. Spear requested comments and questions on the minutes. There being none, Mr. Spear asked for a motion to approve the minutes. A motion was made by John Taylor to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mike McClendon. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Mr. Spear presented the financial report. A motion was made by Mark Kirkpatrick to approve the financial report. The motion was seconded by Harvey Everheart. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Discuss and take possible action to appoint a Region O Administrator.

Mr. Spear reported that on June 27, 2013, Jim Conkwright tendered his resignation as Region O Administrator. At the time of his resignation Mr. Conkwright recommended that Chairman Brown consider appointing Sherry Stephens as Interim Region O Administrator until the planning group could appoint an administrator.

After several discussions with Doug Shaw, TWDB Project Manager, Carmon McCain, Interim General Manager of HPWD, and with Ms. Stephens's permission, Chairman Brown formally appointed Ms. Stephens the Interim Region O Administrator.

Mr. Spear explained that while the bylaws permit the executive committee to appoint the Region O Administrator, Chairman Brown requests input from the planning group on this appointment. It is Chairman Brown's recommendation that the planning group appoint Ms. Stephens as Region O Administrator. A motion was made by Melanie Barnes that Ms. Stephens be appointed Region O Administrator. The motion was seconded by Jim Steiert. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Receive a report from the Officer Nominating Committee regarding electing a vice chairman for 2013.

Delmon Ellison, Officer Nominating Committee, was called to preside over the meeting. Mr. Spear left the meeting. Mr. Ellison reported that on June 27, 2013, Jim Conkwright resigned his position as Vice Chairman of the Region O planning group. As a result, Chairman Brown requested a meeting of the Officer Nominating Committee. The members of the Officer Nominating Committee members were Bob Josserand, Aubrey Spear, and Delmon Ellison.

Mr. Ellison reported that he and Mr. Josserand met with Chairman Brown by phone to discuss filling the Vice Chairman vacancy created by the resignation of Jim Conkwright. During these meetings Mr. Ellison suggested that Mr. Spear be nominated as Vice Chairman. Chairman Brown and Mr. Josserand agreed. When asked if he would serve as Vice Chairman if elected, Mr. Spear indicated that he would and immediately resigned from the Officer Nominating Committee.

Mr. Ellison reported that the committee is recommending that Aubrey Spear be elected Vice Chair of the Region O planning group. Mr. Ellison asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none he proceeded to Item 8 Election of Vice chairman.

8. Discuss and take possible action on election a Vice Chairman for 2013.

Delmon Ellison asked for a motion to elect Aubrey Spear as Vice Chairman. A motion was made by Mark Kirkpatrick to elect Aubrey Spear as Vice Chairman. The motion was seconded by Kent Satterwhite. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Ellison thanked Mr. Spear for his service. Vice Chairman Spear was called to preside over the meeting.

9. Discuss the nomination process for appointing an additional voting member to represent water districts.

Sherry Stephens reported that on June 27, 2013, Jim Conkwright resigned his position as Water District Representative on the Region O planning group. As a result, Chairman Brown is soliciting nominations for a voting member to represent water districts to serve a term expiring in 2017. Nomination packets should include a cover letter from the nominee explaining how the nominee is qualified to serve on the planning group, a resume, and a minimum of two and a maximum of six letters of support. At least one recommendation letter should come from a member of the regional planning group. Submit nomination packets to Sherry Stephens, High Plains Water District, 2930 Avenue Q, Lubbock, Texas 79411 before 5:00 p.m., Monday, September 30, 2013.

Ms. Stephens told the group that once she receives the nomination packets, she will forward them to the Executive Committee for their review and recommendation.

10. Discuss and take possible action to approve population and municipal demand projections.

Sara Eatman walked the group through the technical memo that is being proposed for submittal to the TWDB on or before August 16, 2013. All the data has been discussed in previous meetings and the methodology has not changed. The technical memo is the result of assimilating the data into report form.

Ms. Eatman reminded the group that the due date for submitting all demand projections is August 16, 2013, therefore the planning group is being asked to approve the population and municipal demand projections and methodology at today's meeting. She also reminded the group that there is a formal revision process available if, after submitting their demand projections, the group finds it necessary to change them.

Ms. Eatman began by clearly defining the terms "adopted", "draft" and "revised" numbers. *Adopted numbers* are adopted numbers from the state water plan from the last round of planning. *Draft numbers* are numbers given to the planning group from the TWDB to review. *Revised numbers* are adopted or draft numbers that have been changed by the planning group.

Ms. Eatman continued her presentation by explaining how the planning group used feedback from water user groups within the regional planning area to revise adopted and draft population projections to better reflect the growth that is anticipated while staying within the total regional population demand. She reminded the group that the TWDB used a 50-percent migration rate for the whole region, meaning that every county was assigned a 50-percent migration scenario.

Mr. Spear asked Ms. Eatman to verify that when the TWDB applied a 50-percent migration rate, that only half of what was projected is applied for that area. Ms. Eatman verified this. Mr. Spear asked Mr. Shaw to explain how the TWDB decided to apply a 50-percent migration rate to Region O. Mr. Shaw explained that the TWDB compared the results of each projection scenario (100-percent, 50-percent, and no migration) to previous regional and state projections. And in the case of Region O, the 50-percent migration numbers were more consistent with previous projections.

To address concerns presented in previous meetings regarding the application of the 50-percent migration rate, Ms. Eatman explained the process used to verify that a 50-percent migration rate was appropriate. Using census data, state data center information, natural growth, and feedback from local water user groups, Ms. Eatman reapplied all three migration scenarios on a county by county basis. While changes were made from county to county, the total regional population projection did not change.

Mr. Spear mentioned that the City of Lubbock met with the TWDB and DBS&A to discuss how to close the gap between the City's internal population projections and the TWDB's projections for the City. Realizing that the TWDB will not increase the total regional population and that the City of Lubbock cannot pull sufficient population from other user groups to close the gap between the TWDB's and the City's projections, Mr. Spear wanted the record to show that the City of Lubbock does not

agree with the TWDB's population projections for the City of Lubbock. According to Lubbock's projections, the TWDB projections are too low.

Mr. Shaw reminded the group that there are ways to address these situations. For example, the group can over plan. In a situation like this where the group believes the projections for Lubbock are not high enough you can choose to plan, for example, for 120% of Lubbock's need instead of 100%. Also, when developing strategies, the group can develop strategies for Lubbock's municipal needs that include s providing water to surrounding communities.

Ms. Eatman continued her explanation of how municipal water demands were developed by discussing gallons per capita per day (gpcd). The draft gpcd is based on water use surveys from 2011 which represents a drought year in an attempt to capture what it looks like in the worst case scenario. But then as the gpcd is projected forward through the planning horizon, the figure will decrease because the projections include an assumption that efficiency will increase in fixtures and water use practices in the future.

To verify that the draft gpcd projections were appropriate for this region, DBS&A conducted spot checks throughout the region. These spot checks involved subtracting from the total municipal intake of any given city the quantity of water sold to or delivered to another city or industrial user. As a result of this spot check, a couple of minor corrections were made. However, on a regional basis, DBS&A is proposing to use the gpcd projected by the TWDB.

Using the revised population demand projections presented in the technical memo and the gpcd projections provided by the TWDB, DBS&A calculated the municipal demand projections presented in the memo.

Mr. Spear asked for a motion to approve the population and municipal demand projections. A motion was made by Kent Satterwhite. The motion was seconded by Bill Harbin. The motion carries unanimously.

11. Discuss and take possible action to approve irrigation demand projections.

Sara Eatman walked the group through the technical memo that is being proposed for submittal to the TWDB on or before August 16, 2013. Mining, steam-electric, livestock, and manufacturing demand projections and methodologies were approved on June 27, 2013. Ms. Eatman reminded the group that the due date for submitting all demand projections is August 16, 2013, therefore the planning group is being asked to approve the irrigation demand projections and methodology at today's meeting.

Ms. Eatman explained that the methodology for developing the irrigation demand projections involved assessing the total water availability in the region, then subtracting out all non-irrigation demands, which results in the baseline for irrigation demand. The total irrigation demand presented today is that baseline plus a small quantity for advanced conservation. Any conservation that's currently occurring is considered in the baseline projection.

Don McElroy wanted the record to show that a definition of irrigation demand that includes conservation but does not include water that is available and accessible but unused is not right. His concern was that the group is not addressing the "real" irrigation demand because it will result in a deficit or unmet need.

Ms. Eatman indicated that the methodology for determining irrigation demand is structured to meet the desired future condition (DFC) as determined by the groundwater management areas and will assume some unmet need that will be met by advanced conservation.

Delmon Ellison asked Mr. Shaw if the group was required to use this methodology. Mr. Shaw mentioned that he was not familiar with the methodology that the group was using, but was familiar with the draft irrigation demands provided by the TWDB. Mr. Shaw compared the difference in unmet need between the TWDB's draft projections and those resulting from the group's methodology. He explained that using the TWDB's draft projections will more accurately address actual irrigation demand because they are based on historic use. On the other hand, by using the group's current

methodology the irrigation demand is capped by the DFC. The unmet need appears to be greater, though more accurate, when the TWDB's projections are applied.

Jim Steiert recalled addressing the issue at length where in past plans the group chose to show actual demand, which would never be met because there is no way to meet it. Based on that discussion, the group asked DBS&A to develop a different methodology that reduced the unmet need.

Mr. Ellison asked Mr. Shaw if it really mattered which methodology the group chose. Mr. Shaw explained to the group that regardless of the methodology they choose, the final text of the plan could include a discussion that compares the results of the two methodologies and an explanation as to why the group made the decision they did. Mr. Spear asked what methodologies other planning groups were considering. Mr. Shaw stated that to his knowledge the other planning groups were using some variation of the TWDB's draft projections and they too will either have an unmet need or will develop strategies, maybe irrigation conservation, to meet that need. He knows of no planning group that is limiting their demand based on DFCs or MAGs.

Ms. Eatman mentioned that approving the higher irrigation demand projections in no way ignores the fact that in order to meet the DFCs less water must be used and that discussion can be captured in the text of the final plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Steiert to approve the TWDB's draft irrigation projections. The motion was seconded by Mark Kirkpatrick. The motion passed with Delmon Ellison and Harvey Everheart dissenting.

The technical memo will be revised to include the approval of the TWDB's draft irrigation demand projections.

12. Discuss and take possible action to approve the process for determining water source availability.

Sara Eatman explained that the Managed Available Groundwater (MAG) provided by the TWDB does not include groundwater in those portions of the region that do not have groundwater conservation districts or MAGs. These portions of the region estimate usage based on reported production. Ms. Eatman is recommending that the group approve the integration of this production data into the existing MAG.

A motion was made by Delmon Ellison to integrate into the existing MAG any previously unaccounted availability. The motion was seconded by Mr. Everheart. The motion carried unanimously.

David Harkins reminded the group that there are four river basins in the region: Canadian, Red, Brazos, and Colorado. Mr. Harkins explained that the Water Availability Model (WAM) for the Brazos and Colorado river basins have been completed and have been made available for use. However, the WAMs for the Red and Canadian river basins are being update by the TCEQ to include environmental flow restrictions. There is a strong chance that these WAMs will not be updated with regional planning timeframes. Mr. Harkins is recommending that the group approve the use of the existing WAMs in the event the updated WAMs are not completed in time.

A motion wade made by Mike McClendon that the existing WAMs for the Canadian and Red river basins be used in the event that updated WAMs are not completed within regional planning timeframes. The motion was seconded by Mike DeLoach. The motion carried unanimously.

13. Receive a report on legislative items related to the 83rd Texas Legislature.

Doug Shaw reported that as a result of House Bill 4, the Governor will appoint three new members to the TWDB by September 1, and by October 1 a new executive administrator will be named. On November 5, Texas voters will be asked to approve the use of \$2 billion dollars from the rainy day fund to fund water development projects. If Texas voters approve the use of this money, then regional planning groups will be required to prioritize the water management strategies (WMSs) identified in the 2011 plan and also in the 2016 plan. The draft standards are due to the TWDB by December 1. In order to meet this deadline, the TWDB is forming a stakeholders group made up of regional planning

chairmen who will meet in September and begin to develop standards for prioritizing the WMSs. By June 1, planning groups are required to submit a draft prioritization of the WMSs in the 2011 regional water plans.

14. Receive a report from the Region O Administrator.

No report.

15. Receive a report from GMA #2 and GMA #6 representatives.

GMA #2 has not met. GMA #6 met to reappoint its members to various board and groups and to hear a presentation from Rima Petrossian (TWDB) on submitting DFCs to the state.

16. Receive a report from liaisons to other regional planning groups.

Region A, B and F all met recently to approve their population and municipal demand projections. There was no report for Region G.

17. Receive a report from the TWDB Project Manager.

No report.

18. Receive public input and comments to the planning group.

No input or comments.

19. Consider a date and agenda items for the next meeting.

The next meeting will be held on October 17, 2013.

20. Conduct other business.

No other business.

21. Adjourn the meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 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,

Aubrey Spear, Vice Chairman