

Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

November 10, 2005 10:00 A.M.

Call To Order and Welcome by Chairman H.P. Brown Jr.

Chairman H. P. Brown Jr. called the meeting to order at 10:03 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 member and was also filed in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act at the following locations: *Lubbock County Courthouse, Administrative Offices of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1, the regional water planning group web site at www.llanoplan.org and the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District web site at www.hpwd.com*

Roll Call Of Members and Establish Quorum.

The following Llano Estacado Water Planning Group members were in attendance: Chairman H.P. Brown Jr.; Vice-Chairman Ches Carthel; Secretary-Treasurer Jim Conkwright; and members Melanie Barnes, Delaine Baucum; Bruce Blalack, Dallas Brewer, Harvey Everheart, Bill Harbin, Doug Hutcheson, Don James, Richard Leonard, Terry Lopas, Don McElroy, Gene Montgomery, Ken Rainwater, Kent Satterwhite, and Jim Steiert. Non-voting members in attendance were Joan Glass, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department; Dr. Herb Grubb, HDR Engineering in Austin, Malcolm Laing, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; and Temple McKinnon, Texas Water Development Board.

Unable to attend (excused absences): Those unable to attend today's meeting were Steve Jones (Austin meeting); Bob Jossierand (out-of-state); Jared Miller (out-of-town); and Sukant Misra (in class).

Absent members (unexcused absences): Delmon Ellison Jr.

There was a quorum of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members in attendance (18 of 22 voting members or 81.8% attendance).

Others in attendance: Tom Adams, City of Lubbock; Elliott

Blackburn, *Lubbock Avalanche-Journal*; Jason Coleman, South Plains Underground Water Conservation District; L.C. Childers, City of Wolfforth; Clyde Crumley, Llano Estacado Underground Water Conservation District; Katie Day and Debby Hansard with Senator Robert Duncan's office; Michael Farmer, Texas Tech University; Don McReynolds, High Plains Water District; Frankie Pittman, City of Wolfforth; Judy Reeves, High Plains Water District; Stefan Schuster, Freese and Nichols; Ben Weinheimer, Texas Cattle Feeders Association, and C. E. Williams, Region A Chairman & Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District Manager.

Carmon McCain of the High Plains Water District staff was also present to take minutes of the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS:

Approval of the May 19, 2005 regular meeting minutes.

The minutes of the May 19, 2005 LERWPG meeting were provided to members by e-mail / hard copy for review prior to today's meeting. There being no additions or corrections, a motion was made by Dallas Brewer and seconded by Delaine Baucum that the minutes of the May 19, 2005 LERWPG meeting be approved as printed. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Approval of the August 11, 2005 public hearing meeting minutes.

The minutes of the August 11, 2005 LERWPG public hearing were provided to members by e-mail / hard copy for review prior to today's meeting. There being no additions or corrections, a motion was made by Terry Lopas and seconded by Ches Carthel that the minutes of the August 11, 2005 LERWPG public hearing be approved as printed. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Approval of the Financial Statement.

The Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group financial statement for the period ending October 31, 2005 was provided to members for review. Jim Conkwright said the report shows an ending balance of \$97,257.92. A motion to accept the report as printed was made by Bill Harbin and seconded by Ches Carthel. **All voted "aye," and the**

motion was unanimously approved.

The LERWPG will hear a presentation about the Texas Alliance For Water Conservation (SB 1053) demonstration project in Floyd and Hale Counties from Project Leader Rick Kellison.

Mr. Conkwright told the group that this presentation would be given during the noon hour since Mr. Kellison has a 4 p.m. demonstration project meeting at the High Plains Water District office.

The LERWPG will review and consider response to the Texas Water Development Board's comments regarding the draft initially prepared plan.

Chairman Brown thanked each of the regional water planning group members in attendance at today's meeting. He stated that this is a very important meeting with a great deal of editing and revisions needing to be made to the draft initially prepared plan.

Chairman Brown then called on Project Consultant Dr. Herb Grubb of HDR Engineering in Austin, who discussed the points outlined in the handout, "LERWPG meeting, November 10, 2005."

Dr. Grubb reminded the group that they approved the draft initially prepared plan on May 19; the plan was delivered to the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) and released for public review on June 1; a public hearing was held August 11 in Lubbock to receive public comments concerning the draft IPP; and that comments were received through the October 10 deadline.

Comments received from the public included those of the Texas Water Development Board, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, City of Silverton, City of Lubbock, National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense, Sierra Club, and J. Collier Adams.

The following actions were taken in response to these comments:

Executive Summary was revised.

Section 1.2.3 (Physiography, Geology, Soils, and Vegetation) was revised.

Section 4.4.1.2 (Irrigation Water Conservation) was revised.

New water management strategies for the City of Lubbock were added. These include brackish ground water desalination, the Jim Bertram Lakes Project expansion (Lakes 7 & 8), the North Fork scalping project, and the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority (CRMWA) II pipeline.

Additional local ground water strategies were added for the White River Municipal Water District, Briscoe County (Silverton and Quitaque), Floyd County (Replacing Lake MacKenzie water for Lockney), and Swisher County (Replacing Lake MacKenzie water for Tulia).

Responses to the Section 9 IFR survey were added.

Responses to comments received from the Texas Water Development Board and the public were also added.

Dr. Grubb then addressed each comment contained in the TWDB's September 28 letter.

ES-11: The technicality has been reconciled.

ES-14: This will have to be worked out in the final version of the plan.

Population and demand figures for river basins were checked for consistency with the planning database.

Chapter 3: Groundwater district management plans were summarized and included in the draft IPP.

Table 3-1 on Page 3-6 does show the water supply information by type of use.

Surface water supplies using WAM run 3 (Lake MacKenzie and White River) were completed and included.

There is a brief discussion about water rights in Section 3.2 and also as Appendix F.

Ground water availability for each county and aquifers in the RWPG is explained in Section 3.2.

The firm yield of Lake Alan Henry is being verified with consultants.

Data contained in Tables 4-1 to 4-22 were verified and are correct.

Chapter 4.4.4.4: The TWDB's suggestion to revise strategies is not appropriate.

A description of how the plan protects water contracts, option agreements, or special water resources was added to Section 4.5.

Page 4-216: Drought contingency is not a recommended strategy for certain water groups with a need because it is not economically feasible. The RWPG recognizes each city's individual drought management plans.

Section 4.4.1.2; Section 4.5: A revised irrigation water management strategy has been developed for consideration by the LERWPG members.

Page 4-85, Table 4-23: Water supplies and availability, water demands, and needs for each wholesale water provider by category of use as shown in DB07 is included as Appendix G.

Pages 4-223, 4-230, 4-249, 4-255, 4-260, 4-264, 4-271, 4-273, and 4-285: Conservation was not adopted for some municipal WUGs. Conservation was included up to the point where the RWPG goal of 172 gallons of water per person per day was achieved. Also, the cost-effectiveness of the strategy was also considered.

Dr. Grubb said he was unclear about TWDB Comment # 17 - "Provide a quantitative reporting of environmental factors is included in the evaluation of water management strategies." He will ask TWDB staff about this.

Tables 4.4-12 through 4.4-40 were revised to include interest during construction periods as applicable.

Pages 4-204 and 205: Costs for brine concentrate disposal associated with brackish ground water desalination were added. These data were inadvertently omitted from the draft IPP.

Pages 4-124 through 4-152, Tables 4.4.12 to 4.4.40: O&M costs were added as applicable.

Costs of each water management strategy considered according to guidelines in Contract Exhibit B were addressed elsewhere in 18, 19, and 20. It is hoped that this is adequate for the TWDB's concerns.

Pages 2-20, Table 2-9: The 2060 beef cattle feedlot water demand data were incorrect and have been revised.

Pages 4-98 & 4-99, Table 4.4-4: Smyer, Terry County-Other, Deaf Smith County-Other, Wolfforth, and Shallowater were accidentally omitted from this table. This has been

corrected.

Table 4-23 and text were revised to provide consistency in the number of wholesale water providers.

Page 270: The TWDB asks that the RWPG consider providing an explanation for the reason water conservation strategies are not recommended for Lubbock past 2020. This is explained in the text. Conservation is recommended until the regional goal of 172 gallons per person per day is achieved.

Page 308: Reference to TNRCC changed to TCEQ.

Page 4-307: Descriptions will be revised in the final version to reflect correct section titles.

Dr. Ken Rainwater entered the meeting at 10:37 a.m.

Chairman Brown then moved to Agenda Item 9.

The LERWPG will consider addition of four new water supply strategies proposed by the City of Lubbock to the draft initially prepared plan.

The City of Lubbock discussed their four new water management strategies, which include brackish ground water desalination, Jim Bertram Lakes expansion (Lakes 7&8), North Fork Scalping project, and the CRMWA II pipeline from Roberts County.

The proposed City of Lubbock new water management strategies and data associated with them prompted numerous questions from both regional water planning group members and the audience.

They included:

Cost of brine disposal associated with desalination of brackish ground water.

Determination of flow rate of wells drilled into the Dockum aquifer.

Use of brackish ground water contained in the Trinity/Dockum aquifers.

Computer modeling of the firm yield of the proposed Lakes 7 & 8 in the Jim Bertram

system.

Effluent discharge into the proposed lakes.

North Fork Scalping operation and associated modeling.

CRMWA II Pipeline.

Mr. Carthel addressed each question, stating that many of these issues have not been worked out as yet. The City of Lubbock wishes to include these strategies in the regional water management plan in order to be eligible to qualify for funding from the Texas Water Development Board and permits from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.

Deputy City Manager Tom Adams said the City of Lubbock developed these water plan strategies and there are still related studies to be conducted. It is important to have alternatives in the regional water management plan as the city moves forward with its water planning. He said he would appreciate the RWPG giving favorable consideration to these strategies. Without the strategies included in the plan, Adams said it would be impossible for the city to obtain TCEQ permits and TWDB funding for the respective strategies.

Panhandle Water Planning Group (Region A) Chairman C.E. Williams said he supported the brackish ground water desalination, the Jim Bertram Lake System expansion, and the North Fork Scalping project. However, he questioned the need for the CRMWA II project during the next 50 years. Mr. Carthel responded that the City of Lubbock actual population growth does not match the projections in the plan. Each project is a piece of the city's total water planning package.

Mr. Williams expressed concern about the amount of water to be withdrawn from Region A through the proposed CRMWA II pipeline. He said he did not want a conflict developing between Regions A and O. He suggested that the respective RWPGs take the next five years to study this. He also expressed grave concern about the CRMWA II pipeline strategy being introduced at such a late date in the planning process. In his opinion, there is no immediate rush or need for the CRMWA II pipeline project. Any conflict between the two respective regional water plans would be sent to the TWDB for resolution. He again stated that he believed there is no immediate need for the

CRMWA II pipeline and that the city and region should not rush into this.

Chairman Brown said that the CRMWA II pipeline would not be full at first-but that it would be helpful in augmenting water supplies for Lubbock, Plainview, and other CRMWA member cities. Due to water marketing in the northern Panhandle, it is important for this region to show strong support in meeting its water needs.

Mr. Adams said the City of Lubbock will need a major water supply sometime between 2015 and 2035. Malcolm Laing asked how Lake Alan Henry fits into this water puzzle. He, too, is concerned about this water management strategy being added so late in the process.

Don McElroy asked Mr. Carthel about the downside of not including this water management strategy in the current plan. Mr. Carthel said accessibility to apply for permits from the TCEQ and funding from the TWDB were the main downsides. Inconsistency with the regional water plan is a definite road block. He added that the City of Lubbock will need all these water management strategies in the next 100 years-but that not all of them will be needed during the next 50 years.

Mr. Williams said he had no opposition to the first three proposed strategies and little opposition to the CRMWA II pipeline IF the two regions take the time to handle it correctly. He said recommended strategies and alternative strategies are allowed in the regional water plans. If each region coordinates their strategy, then appropriate language could be added to both regional water plans.

Mr. Adams said it was not the City of Lubbock's intention to bring this strategy in at the last minute. It has just taken a considerable amount of time to pull the data together. The City of Lubbock needs a pipeline to bring water from Roberts County. He noted that there are other water management strategies being implemented, including use of ground water beneath the city for irrigation of parks and school playgrounds.

He told the group that the current CRMWA pipeline is at capacity during the summer. The Bailey County well field helps meet summer peak water demand. If the Bailey County well field loses capacity, then the City of Lubbock's water supply could be cut in half. Lake Alan Henry would not be able to compensate this loss, as it could lose its firm yield in the next 50 years.

Lunch Recess

Chairman Brown recessed the meeting for lunch at 11:50 a.m. Mr. Lopas and Mr. Leonard left the meeting at this time.

Reconvene & TWAC presentation

Chairman Brown reconvened the meeting at 12:30 p.m. He then introduced Rick Kellison, who manages the Texas Alliance for Water Conservation demonstration project in Floyd and Hale Counties. Mr. Kellison gave a brief PowerPoint presentation about the project and answered questions from the planning group members. Mr. Blalack joined the meeting at 12:50 p.m.

Continued Discussion

During the lunch hour, Temple McKinnon met with Mr. Williams and some representatives of Region O to work out the potential interregional conflict issues. She said a meeting will be held next week with representatives of the TWDB, Region A, and Region O to develop language to avoid a potential conflict. There are many questions to be resolved, and there is no guarantee that designation of the CRMWA II pipeline as an alternative strategy would allow state funding and permits.

Harvey Everheart said he had many questions and concerns about the CRMWA II pipeline. Why was this not mentioned at the August 11 public hearing to receive comments on the draft initially prepared plan? Why was there no mention of this strategy from August 11 to October 10 (end of the comment period)? He said the regional water planning group should have known about this much earlier.

Mr. Carthel said the City of Lubbock included this with their October 10 comments. Much of the data was only able to be put together from August 11 until now. Mr. Everheart said he still felt the City of Lubbock should have given the regional water planning group advance notice of these proposed water strategies to be submitted at the last minute. Mr. Carthel apologized, but said this was the best that they could do.

Chairman Brown said the City of Lubbock has submitted four water management strategies. Of the four, the last one (CRMWA II) has been the most contentious. Mr. Everheart is questioning all of them. It was Chairman Brown's earlier thought that the LERWPG should consider a motion to adopt all but the last strategy. However, he is

now thinking that the LERWPG should consider each strategy individually.

Mr. Everheart said he has no objection to the individual water management strategies. His concern is that the City of Lubbock failed to give the LERWPG advance notice that they were considering these strategies for inclusion in the plan. He felt that the LERWPG was not "kept in the loop."

Mr. Adams apologized for the timeliness of Lubbock's new water management strategies. The planning statement was approved in late September or early October.

Mr. Conkwright said he and Mr. Brown serve on the Lubbock Water Advisory Commission. The data for the first three projects did not come together until late spring and early summer. He said he felt that there was no intent to put anything past anyone. It is just that the water planning process has greatly accelerated in the past few months as the deadline to submit the regional water plan nears.

Mr. Montgomery said he concurred with Mr. Everheart. It appears that there have been four solutions offered to a problem the group was unaware about. The group should have been made aware of this earlier.

A motion was made by Don McElroy and seconded by Ken Rainwater that any action concerning approval or denial of the four proposed City of Lubbock water management strategies be delayed until the LERWPG's December 15, 2005 meeting. The City of Lubbock will come back to the group with additional information about the first three strategies. Also, representatives from Regions A & O are to meet face to face to resolve their differences.

Mr. Everheart expressed concern that waiting until December 15, 2005 may not give Dr. Grubb adequate time to complete the project to meet the TWDB's January 5 deadline. Dr. Grubb said he would have to leave "placeholders" to include the data in the draft plan.

After discussion, the motion was amended to include the first three management strategies in the plan and to defer any action regarding the fourth strategy (CRMWA II) until the December 15, 2005 meeting. **There were 14 voting in favor of the motion and one voting against. The motion was approved.**

Melanie Barnes said people on various overlapping boards should be more diligent in communicating between groups. It is possible that potential conflicts regarding the CRMWA II pipeline strategy could have been avoided with better communication between groups.

Mr. McElroy asked if there were any potential conflicts between the Lubbock Water Advisory Council and the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District. Mr. Conkwright said there were no issues as yet. Mr. McElroy asked if there could be a potential conflict with the proposed brackish ground water desalination project. Mr. Conkwright said he has expressed the district's concern about drilling Dockum wells in the Bailey County well field.

Chairman Brown then asked the group to consider Agenda Item 10(d) as Mr. Montgomery needs to go to the airport to make his flight.

The LERWPG will review and consider response to other public comments received regarding the draft initially prepared plan.

Chairman Brown asked Mr. Montgomery to respond to comments contained in J. Collier Adams' letter. In his letter, Adams is concerned about the protection and use of fresh water by the oil and gas industry in the LERWPG.

Mr. Adams' comments and the LERWPG responses are as follows:

Companies are permitted by the Railroad Commission of Texas to dispose of brackish produced water into the Santa Rosa. Both the RRC and TCEQ review every injection permit application and define for that well where the usable quality water zones are located. The RRC has strict regulations on how the zones are to be protected from contamination. Permits are not issued for disposal of brackish produced water into any zone, including the Santa Rosa. Violations should be immediately brought to the attention of the RRC and TCEQ.

Companies prefer to use cheap clean water from the Ogallala for secondary recovery. The RRC and TCEQ review each injection permit. Fresh water is always the fluid of last choice. The mining industry in the IPP accounts for less than 0.5 percent of the total fresh water use in the region.

Oil companies do not use Santa Rosa water to supplement secondary recovery fluid because it is chemically incompatible.

Some Dockum water is used, but it is indeed limited due to chemical incompatibility with the produced water from many secondary recovery projects. While there is the possibility that precipitation of dissolved solids in the water may plug oil producing formation, it should be noted that more than 90 percent of the water used by the oil and gas industry in the region is met with recycled water.

Companies do not monitor injection systems for line leaks. These undetected leaks can contaminate shallow aquifers. Due to high pressure, line leaks cannot go undetected as they worsen very quickly and are easily identified.

Mr. Carthel said the City of Lubbock plans to respond to the comments in Mr. Adams' letter. He said much of Mr. Adams' comments are based upon experiences with salt water brine contamination on his property near Morton.

Dr. Judy Reeves said there has been historical injection of salt water into the Dockum (Santa Rosa) aquifer. Mr. Montgomery questioned why persons would wish to expend costs to do so when the brackish water could be taken by vacuum into the Ellenberger formation.

Three amendments to the response were suggested by the regional water planning group members. A motion to accept the amended response to Mr. Adams' letter was made by Ken Rainwater and seconded by Kent Satterwhite. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Montgomery, Ms. Day, and Ms. Hansard left the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

Chairman Brown then asked Ms. Barnes to discuss her revisions to the geologic descriptions included in the plan. She stated that this was an attempt to reflect the current thinking about the geology and hydrology of the Ogallala aquifer. She added many geologists call it the High Plains aquifer rather than the Ogallala aquifer. A motion was made by Dr. Barnes and seconded by Jim Conkwright to accept the revised geologic descriptions as printed. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Chairman Brown asked Jim Steiert for a response to comments by Environmental Defense, National Wildlife Federation, and the Sierra Club. Dr. Grubb added that the comments to the TWDB must be individually answered; however, response to comments from others

can be summarized. Copies of this summary, "Comments for Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group Initially Prepared Plan," have been provided to RWPG members for review.

Dr. Grubb discussed the responses contained in the handout with the group. He then asked Mr. Steiert to discuss the environmental group comments.

Mr. Steiert responded that these groups are disappointed that no ecologically unique stream segments were designated in Region O. It was the decision of the group that there was no clear value to the designation. No other group in the state made a designation, either. Another major concern is Region O setting a regional water use goal of 172 gallons of water per person per day. The ultimate state goal is 140 gallons of water per person per day. It appears that this has been covered by Dr. Grubb in Section 16.

Mr. Steiert said Dr. Grubb's summary comments regarding the environment are "on target," and that he had no problem with them.

Dr. Grubb then reviewed the other summary comments contained in the document. After discussion, a motion to accept the responses with suggested revisions was made by Judge Dallas Brewer and seconded by Mr. Carthel. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Everheart, Mr. Leonard, and Mr. Steiert left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

The LERWPG will consider approving new language for inclusion in the draft initially prepared plan based upon TWDB comments.

Chairman Brown asked the group to go back to Agenda Item 8 to consider new irrigation water conservation language for inclusion in Section 4.4.1.2. Dr. Grubb reviewed the proposed changes to the draft language with the members.

He said the changes in the document begin with page 6. Some of the irrigation water conservation best management practices (BMPs) as included in the Task Force report are not applicable to the LERWPG, such as lining of district irrigation canals, replacement of district irrigation canals and lateral canals with pipelines, and nursery production systems.

In addition to furrow dikes, Mr. McElroy suggested deep chiseling or ripping be added to the region's BMP list. Also, volumetric measurement of irrigation water use should also be added. Mr. Conkwright suggested that irrigation scheduling needs to be worked in as well.

On Page 9, the first sentence under the header, "Irrigation Water Conservation Water Management Strategy for the Llano Estacado Regional Water Plan," should be deleted. Dr. Rainwater asked if the paragraph before the header was in the right order. It was suggested that it be moved to page 7 or other appropriate area.

Page 10 contains new language reflecting new irrigated acreage data. Table 4.4-10 contains the new information as well. New language and tabular data regarding estimates of irrigation water conservation potential, estimates of projected irrigation water conservation potentials, and cost per acre-foot are shown on pages 12-14.

Mr. McElroy asked about the percentage of accuracy in the center pivot inventory. He asked if it was within 25 percent accuracy. Mr. Conkwright said the numbers are within three percent accuracy. The previous regional water plan may have overestimated the number of pivots in operation. Mr. McElroy said there are more center pivots in operation than shown by these data. He said the data shows 61 percent of the irrigated acreage in Bailey County is covered with pivots. He said he did not believe that his dealership or Ms. Baucum's dealership accounted for sales of 40 percent of the total number of center pivots in operation during the past 20 years.

Table 4.4-13 shows the projected irrigation shortage, irrigation conservation potentials, and projected shortage with irrigation conservation. The Briscoe County calculations were omitted and will be added to the final version.

Dr. Rainwater asked for clarification of the footnote on Table 4.4-12.

A motion was made by Bill Harbin and seconded by Jim Conkwright that all revisions to Section 4.4.1.2, "Irrigation Water Conservation," be approved as presented. **All voted "aye," and the motion was unanimously approved.**

Dr. Grubb noted that there were a few changes to be made to the Executive Summary. Local ground water strategies were added for White River Municipal Water District, Briscoe County (Quitaque and

Silverton), Floyd County (Lockney), and Swisher County (Tulia). New language was added stating that the regional water planning group recognizes that the Ogallala Formation with any pumping is not sustainable. Dr. Barnes asked if this referred to the Ogallala aquifer—rather than the formation.

Mr. McElroy noted that the statistic of 27,149 head of dairy cattle as shown on page 9 is incorrect and should be changed.

Dr. Barnes asked that the saturated thickness range on page 5 be changed to read “more than 300 feet,” rather than 200 feet as printed. She said the second sentence dealing with recharge beginning with “One-half inch of recharge...” is too detailed for the executive summary and should be deleted.

The irrigation water conservation best management practices in the region as shown in the executive summary need to be consistent with changes made earlier.

A paragraph was added stating that the planning group recommends adoption of new irrigated water conservation methods currently available or which may become available in the future. Particular attention should be given to strategies resulting from the Texas Alliance for Water Conservation demonstration project.

Chairman Brown suggested the addition of salt cedar eradication as part of brush control so that future projects may be eligible for TWDB funding.

Dr. Rainwater questioned the statement, “The projected water use seems to suggest a trend of 50 percent depletion of the current supply over a 50-year period.” He wondered if this implied that the regional water planning group was telling the ground water conservation districts what to do. Dr. Grubb said this simply suggests a trend and nothing else.

A motion to approve revisions to the executive summary was made by Don McElroy and seconded by Melanie Barnes. **All voted “aye,” and the motion was unanimously approved.**

The LERWPG will consider revising the draft initially prepared plan based upon comments received.

Based upon discussion at today's meeting, this agenda item has been accomplished and no additional action is needed.

The LERWPG will consider approval of the final 2006 Llano Estacado Regional Water Plan and authorize its submission to the Texas Water Development Board in accordance with the January 5, 2005 deadline.

No action was taken on this agenda item. It will be placed on the December 15, 2005 agenda.

The extended discussion regarding the four new City of Lubbock water management strategies prompted Mr. Satterwhite to wonder if the CRMWA linear well fields must be added to the final plan as well. Dr. Grubb will develop appropriate language for consideration by the group at the December 15 meeting.

The LERWPG will hear a report from Dr. Herb Grubb with HDR Engineering, Inc.

Dr. Grubb had no additional comments at this time.

The LERWPG will hear a report from LERWPG Project Manager Temple McKinnon.

Ms. McKinnon had no additional comments at this time.

The LERWPG will hear a report from the Regional Water Planning Group liaisons.

Region A: Kent Satterwhite deferred to LERWPG Project Manager Temple McKinnon, who reported Region A will meet Dec. 1. There will be ongoing coordination efforts between Regions A & O to resolve potential conflicts associated with the CRMWA II pipeline.

Region B: Ches Carthel reported Region B has set a meeting Dec. 15 to adopt their plan. He will be unable to attend that meeting as it coincides with the next LERWPG meeting. They are expected to adopt their region's plan at this meeting.

Region F: Harvey Everheart left the meeting and no report was given.

Region G: Terry Lopas left the meeting and no report was given.

Other Business

Public Comment: Chairman Brown asked for additional public comments from the audience. None were provided.

Chairman Brown thanked the group for their attendance during today's lengthy meeting. He reminded them of the next regular meeting set for Dec. 15, 2005.

Adjourn

There being no additional business, Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Conkwright, Secretary-Treasurer

These minutes were approved by the LERWPG at their December 15, 2005 meeting.