

# Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group Meeting

October 8, 2015

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 10:00 a.m. in the A. Wayne Wyatt Board Room of the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District No. 1 office, 2930 Avenue Q in Lubbock, Texas.

Notice of the meeting was provided to each voting/non-voting member/interested parties 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; H.P. Brown, Jr.; Jack Campsey; Delmon Ellison, Jr.; Harvey Everheart; Bill Harbin; Doug Hutcheson; Ronnie Hopper; Michael McClendon; Charlie Morris; Dr. Ken Rainwater; Kent Satterwhite; Aubrey Spear; Jim Steiert; John Taylor; and Jimmy Wedel.

A quorum of Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members was in attendance (*16 of 20 voting members or 80% attendance*).

**Voting members unable to attend (excused absences):** Jason Coleman, Mark Kirkpatrick, and Don McElroy.

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

**Non-voting members in attendance:** Non-voting members in attendance were Sarah Backhouse, TWDB; John Clayton, TPWD; Amy Ewing, Daniel B. Stephens and Associates; and Jason Lindeman for Jay Keith, TCEQ.

**Non-voting members unable to attend (excused absences):** Matt Williams, TDA.

**Others in attendance:** The following names were obtained from a sign-in sheet at today's meeting. Amber Blount, Sandy Land UWCD; Kelly Davila, SPAG; Lindy Harris, South Plains UWCD; GayLynn Hobgood, Office of Rep. John Frullo; Paula Jo Lemonds, HDR; Dan Seale, HPWD Board Member; Keith Sides, USDA-NRCS; Belinda Solis, SPAG; Andrew Teeple, USGS; Kelly Baker, DBS&A; Neil Blandford, DBS&A; and Kelly Young. *(There may have been others in attendance--but they did not sign in at the start of the meeting.)*

Kody Bessent of the High Plains Water District staff served as recording secretary for the meeting. Cathy Sosebee with Cathy Sosebee and Associates transcribed the meeting.

### **3. Remarks by Kathleen Jackson, TWDB Board member**

Chairman Brown introduced Texas Water Development Board member Kathleen Jackson of Beaumont. She was appointed to the TWDB by Governor Rick Perry on March 18, 2014.

Director Jackson thanked the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group members for their leadership and their work in the water planning process.

She provided an update on the State Water Implementation Fund (SWIFT) for Texas, authorized by Proposition 6. The constitutional amendment moved \$2 billion from the state's "Rainy Day Fund" to SWIFT for funding water projects. The TWDB made commitments of \$1 billion dollars toward water infrastructure in 2015 and another \$4 billion dollars in the next 10 years. The SWIFT fund received an AAA bond rating, which will allow the overall program to have a low interest rate, benefiting smaller communities who wish to participate in the program.

She encouraged the group to use the TWDB as a source of funds for water infrastructure projects. In addition, the TWDB is willing to assist with any requests for water data in Texas. "We are a resource—and not a regulatory agency. The TWDB has the money, we have the technology, but it is up to the local communities to come together with their leadership. You are the folks that are here in this room who put those types of projects together to meet the water needs of the future," she said.

Director Jackson thanked Chairman Brown for the opportunity to speak at today's Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group meeting.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**4. Discuss and take possible action to approve the minutes of the September 10, 2015 regular meeting.**

Draft minutes of the September 10, 2015 regular meeting were provided to the members prior to today's meeting. Jason Lindeman of the TCEQ noted that he was in attendance at the meeting—but this was not reflected in the minutes. A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Mr. Satterwhite and seconded by Mr. Morris. All members voted "aye" and the amended minutes were unanimously approved.

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

The September 2015 financial report was provided to the members prior to today's meeting. Secretary-Treasurer Hutcheson reported a September 30, 2015 bank balance of \$111,429.40. A motion to accept the financial report as presented was made by John Taylor and seconded by Jim Steiert. All members voted "aye" and the financial report was unanimously approved as presented.

**6. Discuss and consider accepting the resignation of Jay Keith as the non-voting TCEQ representative.**

Jay Keith has been promoted to Section Manager of the TCEQ's Region 2 Lubbock office. As a result, he is resigning his position as the TCEQ representative for the regional water planning group. Jason Lindeman will fill the position on the group. A motion to accept Mr. Keith's resignation was made by Ronnie Hopper and seconded by Dr. Melanie Barnes. All members voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.

**7. Discuss and review the LERWPG's response to public comments received regarding the Initially Prepared 2016 Llano Estacado Regional Water Management Plan.**

Chairman Brown called on Ms. Ewing to discuss this agenda item.

The technical consultants have revised earlier responses to public comments about the draft IPP that were received from the Texas Water Development Board, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, and verbal responses received at the June 18, 2015 public hearing in Lubbock.

## **Response to TWDB:**

Clarifications were made regarding surface water modeling, which were based upon drought of record conditions.

The technical consultants are seeking clarification from the TWDB regarding surface water modeling of Lake Alan Henry. Two years ago, DBS&A provided a letter to the TWDB stating the surface water modeling assumptions. This letter was approved; however, some of the modifications made in the 2016 plan may not have been covered by that letter. Ms. Ewing is waiting to hear back from the TWDB to see if the modeling is covered by the previous letter or not. If not, a revised assumptions letter will be drafted and presented at the Nov. 12 meeting for ratification.

The bulk of the TWDB comments pertain to Chapter 5 of the draft IPP. This chapter is being restructured for clarification. The consultants have addressed each of the concerns raised by the TWDB.

These include:

- Presenting the volumes of water that are associated with the recommended conservation strategies that have capital costs.
- Making sure that the federally mandated municipal water conservation measures are not included in the demand savings calculations.
- Removing a few operations and management components discussed as part of the agricultural water conservation strategies since they are not allowed to be included in the plan.
- Use of the unified costing model for all projects, unless more detailed information is available, to develop cost estimates.
- The plan should only present the Region O supplies that come from the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority (CRMWA) projects—and not evaluate these strategies. Evaluations will be included in the Region A water management plan.
- A table that summarizes the municipal water demand savings due to plumbing fixture requirements was provided by the TWDB for inclusion in the plan.
- There were comments about using a more quantitative evaluation method for strategies. An impact matrix was constructed and Kelly Baker will discuss this later in today's meeting.

- There were several comments about the difference in the Task 4D scope of work for the strategies and how that compared to the strategies which were fully evaluated in the plan. There was considerable discussion about this at the last regular meeting. These have all been clearly detailed in the plan and response to comments.
- The TWDB asked for clarification on which water management strategies are being recommended. This has been done.
- The TWDB asked for a summary of unmet needs remaining after all strategies have been implemented. This has been added.
- The TWDB asked that wholesale water provider needs be presented by river basin and by county. This has been done.
- The TWDB asked for a statement regarding any water availability requirements that had been promulgated by a county commissioner's court. This would apply to the Briscoe, Hale, and Swisher County Priority Groundwater Management Area (PGMA). There are no such applicable requirements and a statement to that effect has been added.
- The plan requires the regional water planning group to provide the number of potential emergency connections and resulting water supply. This information, which is not to be included in the plan, was reviewed by a subcommittee. The number of connections will be added to the text.
- The TWDB asked if any of the drought contingency plans for the water user groups in the region had listed emergency interconnections between systems as part of their drought management strategies. This will be noted in the plan.
- The TWDB asked how the drought preparedness council's recommendations were taken into account. This was addressed in the plan.
- The remaining level two comments from the TWDB were editorial in nature.

Ms. Ewing asked for any comments or questions.

Mr. Steiert asked how rainwater harvesting and playa basin management could be labeled as being "not potentially feasible."

Ms. Ewing explained that practices, such as rainwater harvesting, graywater reuse, playa basin management, and no-till farming are important—but this plan does not identify a specific project, and so that is why they are being labeled as not potentially feasible.

There was a brief discussion about brush management projects conducted by CRMWA as well as the City of Lubbock. Ms. Ewing said this is noted in the best management practices section of the plan—but brush management is not included as a future strategy that creates water.

She noted that the deadline for entering data into the TWDB's DB17 is Friday, October 9. The technical consultants have been working to complete this effort and to provide the accompanying documentation.

Ms. Ewing then discussed the comments received during the June 18, 2015 public hearing in Lubbock.

Comments offered by Dr. Judy Reeves were discussed and addressed at the last meeting. The consultants worked closely with High Plains UWCD and Mesa UWCD to obtain information to address her concerns.

Ms. Ewing presented a draft response to Mr. Kelly Young's comments from the June 18 public hearing.

Mr. Young questioned whether or not the plan includes the cost of purchasing groundwater rights from private landowners as part of the local groundwater development projects.

Ms. Ewing said, in many cases, those rights are held for these projects—but not all. There are examples in the plan where towns and cities need to purchase water rights for future projects. These rights would need to be obtained before the project can be implemented.

She noted that the costs of purchasing water rights were not included as part of the strategy—but there is clear documentation stating this in the plan.

Region A addressed this in their plan. They used a flat rate of \$500 per acre-foot of water purchased. Ms. Ewing said they did not have enough information to use that cost over such a large region—and therefore it was not included in the plan. It was decided to state such data was not included, rather than pick a number not based in fact. This number will vary across the 21-county LERWPG area.

Mr. Young asked if he could obtain a clarification.

He asked if this base figure was \$500 per acre-foot per year or if it was only for a one-time purchase. If it is the latter, he believes that figure is extremely low.

Mr. Satterwhite said the \$500 per acre-foot is high compared to what CRMWA is paying.

Mr. Young said he disagrees with Mr. Satterwhite, saying he has seen figures of up to \$15,000 per acre-foot of groundwater.

Mr. Satterwhite said CRMWA is paying \$6.50 per acre-foot of groundwater.

Ms. Ewing said this dialogue provides a good reason not to include a set number in the final plan.

Mr. Lindeman asked about the source of data regarding the local drought contingency plans with emergency interconnections. Ms. Ewing said the drought contingency plans were obtained either from TCEQ or the communities. Mr. Lindeman said that he thinks some of the drought contingency plans in this region do call for making emergency connections. DBS&A will take another look at the plans, clarifying this in the final plan. Model plans to be included in the plan were also drafted, and the changes/comments from the TCEQ were incorporated on the model plans.

Chairman Brown asked for any other questions and/or comments. Hearing none, this agenda item was closed.

## **8. Discuss and Consider Authorizing the Technical Consultants To Incorporate the Planning Group's Responses to Public Comments into the Final Version Of the 2016 Regional Water Management Plan.**

Ms. Ewing asked that this be deferred until the next meeting. Hearing no objections, this agenda item was closed.

## **9. Discuss and Consider an Amendment to the Texas Water Development Board Contract for the 5th Cycle of Regional Water Planning that reassigns designated political subdivision duties from the High Plains Underground Water Conservation District to the South Plains Association of Governments.**

Chairman Brown asked Ms. Backhouse to discuss this agenda item.

She called attention to the draft copy of the contract amendment that was provided to the members in advance of today's meeting.

There is some additional information to be added, such as the time needed for HPWD to transfer all Region O materials to SPAG. The TWDB usually gives 60 days from the date of the contract amendment approval for this to happen.

Once the contract amendment is authorized and the information is complete, the TWDB will send a final version to be signed by HPWD and SPAG. Ms. Backhouse will also be

meeting with Ms. Davila to discuss SPAG's responsibilities as the new political subdivision for Region O.

A motion to authorize HPWD and SPAG to execute this contract with amendments was made by Bill Harbin and seconded by Vice-Chairman Spear. There being no discussion, all members voted "aye" and the motion was unanimously approved.

Chairman Brown asked when SPAG will assume the political subdivision duties. Ms. Backhouse said that this will occur once the amendment has been signed by all parties.

Vice-Chairman Spear said he thought the transition would be at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle of planning and prior to the start of the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle of planning. Ms. Backhouse clarified that SPAG's responsibilities are for the fifth cycle and not the fourth. Everything should wrap up by the end of the calendar year.

She added that there are a couple of things that must occur prior to the start of the fifth cycle of regional water planning. First, the regional water planning group must procure its technical consultant. Second, the regional water planning group must hold a public input meeting before any work can commence. These items will likely be held in the spring.

Kelly Davila with SPAG said their Board of Directors meets October 13 to adopt a resolution approving signing of the contract amendment. Once this occurs, she will spend the next month visiting with the regional entities to explain the funding structure with them. She commended HPWD staff for their initial contact and explanation. SPAG will send bills to the regional entities for their share of the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle of planning.

Ms. Ewing noted that the final LERWPG plan must be submitted to the TWDB by December 1, 2015. The board has 90 days to accept the plan. She is working with the TWDB to make sure it is accepted and that no additional revisions are needed.

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

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

Ms. Backhouse reminded the group that one component of the plan is to include the socioeconomic analysis of not meeting water needs and what the resulting impacts will be. She will ask HPWD to forward the report by email to the regional water planning group members.

She reiterated that the next round of SWIFT funding will be for water projects included in the 2016 regional plans and the 2017 State Water Plan. The abridged application period begins December 1, 2015 and continues through February 5, 2016.



The TWDB proposes a new approach for the water demand projections. It is proposed that water utility service areas will be used—rather than city boundaries. TWDB staff will meet with the planning groups and present information on the new approach in early 2016.

She told the group that a stakeholder meeting will be held in February 2016 to review the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle of regional water planning. This will review lessons learned and address concerns that the RWPGs have regarding the process and any technical issues.

Chairman Brown said there was emphasis on rural agribusiness in the SWIFT program. He wondered how many applications were received by the TWDB.

Director Jackson said some abridged applications were received. The TWDB was able to move forward with a water conservation project and a wind project for rural communities. After visiting with community leaders, it was determined that another funding program, other than SWIFT, would be better suited for them.

She added that the TWDB is visiting with representatives of the agriculture community and rural Texas to encourage their participation in the SWIFT process. The sole applicant during this round was for lining of an irrigation canal system in South Texas, sponsored by the Hidalgo County Irrigation District No. 1.

Chairman Brown told Director Jackson that there had been several discussions about SWIFT in relation to production agriculture. He said the requirement that agricultural producers find a political subdivision to sponsor them has been a real impediment. Sponsors in this area could include the City of Lubbock or any of the groundwater conservation districts. Agricultural commodity groups, such as Plains Cotton Growers, are not legitimate sponsors since they are not political subdivisions.

Under the program, the TWDB loans money to the political subdivision, who in turn, lends it out to participants. If the end recipient of the funds does not repay the loan—then the political subdivision is liable for the funds. Mr. McClendon noted that if the political subdivision cannot find a benefit for making such a loan—then why would they want to accept such liability?

Mr. Young recalled the low-interest agricultural water conservation equipment loan program that HPWD administered some years ago. He suggested that HPWD conduct an in-house study to determine how many paid their loans in full, how many defaulted, and if there is a cost-benefit for the district to sponsor participants in the SWIFT program.

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

Ms. Ewing continued discussion of the revisions to Chapter 5 of the plan as it was the biggest change between the draft plan and the proposed final plan. She presented a series of PowerPoint slides showing the Table of Contents which will clearly illustrate the restructured strategy evaluation groupings.

These include:

- Recommended strategies for municipal water user groups.
- Recommended strategies for irrigation water user groups.
- Recommended strategies for the City of Lubbock.
- Recommended strategy for White River Municipal Water District.
- Region O supplies from Region A's strategies for CRMWA.
- Alternative strategies for the City of Lubbock.
- Alternative strategy for municipal WUGs.
- Strategies considered but not recommended.
- Best management practices.
- Water conservation recommendations for all WUG types with needs.

The revised table of contents has been reviewed by the TWDB and meets their requirements.

She also reported that there are a total of 101 recommended strategies in the 2016 plan. Of these, 71 are municipal strategies, 21 are irrigation strategies, and 9 pertain to wholesale water providers, such as the City of Lubbock and White River Municipal Water District.

The TWDB has received the strategy evaluation for brackish groundwater desalination and it meets their requirements. Other strategy evaluations are being completed and the revised Chapter 5 will be provided for review.

Ms. Ewing then asked Ms. Kelly Baker with DBS&A to provide an overview of the impact matrix implementation.

In response to slight changes suggested by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, the consultants revised the matrix since it was discussed at the last meeting. One of the changes made to the matrix was the addition of a “Degree of Impact” criteria. For example, one strategy might impact bald eagles differently than river shiners. It is basically a multiplier of 0.5 or 1.

Another addition to the matrix is designation of “temporarily impacted species” and “permanently impacted species.”

A draft of the matrix has been provided to the RWPG members. There is a potential range of scores from 5-35. The lower the score, the lower the impact. The higher the score, the higher the impact.

The average score by category is as follows:

▪ Irrigation conservation	6.3
▪ Municipal conservation	6.8
▪ Water loss reduction	7.8
▪ Local groundwater development	14.8
▪ Groundwater desalination	15.1
▪ Water reuse	15.1
▪ Other surface water projects	18.5
▪ New major reservoirs	<u>23.6</u>
<b>Overall rank</b>	<b>15.6</b>

Conservation strategies had the lowest impact while surface water projects had the highest impact.

Ms. Baker offered an alternative strategy for the City of Lubbock (direct potable reuse to the North Water Treatment Plant) as an example of how the matrix is used.

Dr. Rainwater commented that most of the values in the matrix are integers and the overall values have a decimal. He asked that these be rounded out accordingly. Ms. Baker said she has done this in her spreadsheet.

Dr. Rainwater also expressed concern about the use of the word “rank” when the data may just be a “score.” Ms. Baker said she would pursue use of the word “score” in the matrix. Dr. Rainwater said it might also be helpful if a sample calculation could be included as well.

Ms. Baker said work continues on the 2011 implementation surveys that look at all of the strategies recommended in the last regional water plan. The consulting firm is in the process of contacting all cities/entities that had strategies in the plan to ask what progress, if any, has been made.

Survey results to date show the 2011 water management strategies have some level of implementation.

This includes:

- Five with local groundwater development.
- 20 relating to irrigation water conservation.
- 15 relating to municipal water conservation.
- 1 other surface water project.

Complete results will be included in Chapter 11 of the final plan.

Mr. Young asked if he could ask a question of Ms. Baker. Chairman Brown asked that he wait until the public comment period.

Ms. Ewing briefly discussed the comparison between the 2011 and 2016 plans.

- There will be a decrease in supply in the 2016 plan for all decades.
- There will be a decrease in the water availability in 2020—mainly groundwater availability.
- There will be an increase in all other decades.
- There will be an increase in municipal needs beginning in 2030.
- There will be a decrease in irrigation needs for all decades.

WMS Type	Number of WMS		
	2011	2016 Recommended	2016 Alternative
Local groundwater development	25	27	
Municipal conservation	25	39	
Irrigation conservation	21	21	
Other surface water	3	3	
New major reservoir	2	1	1
Groundwater desalination	1	3	
Water reuse	1	2	6
Water loss reduction	0	4	
Aquifer storage/recovery	0	1	
Water lease/pipeline	0	0	1
TOTAL	78	101	8

Ms. Ewing asked the group to let her know who needs a printed copy of the final regional water plan. This number is needed at the next RWPG meeting.

Vice-Chairman Spear asked when the final copy will be available for review. The members would like to have it at least a couple of weeks ahead of the November 12 meeting in order to review it. Ms. Ewing said she hopes to have the final copy by October 29<sup>th</sup>. The priority is to get Chapter 5 on the website for viewing/downloading.

Chairman Brown said it would be helpful if changes were highlighted in the documents. Ms. Ewing said it would be easy to do in the other chapters-but not Chapter 5 as the changes are so significant.

Chairman Brown thanked Ms. Ewing and Ms. Baker for their report.

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

No report was given. Mr. Coleman and Mr. McCain are both at out-of-town conferences.

## **13. Receive A Report from the GMA # 2 and GMA # 6 Representatives.**

Chairman Brown called for a report from the GMA # 2 and GMA # 6 representatives.

**GMA # 2:** Mr. Hopper had nothing new to report. He deferred to Mr. Everheart who added that GMA # 2 is waiting on information from the new groundwater availability model. This should be available in the near future.

**GMA # 6:** Mr. Campsey said the next GMA # 6 meeting is October 23<sup>rd</sup>.

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

Chairman Brown called for a report from the liaisons to other regional water planning groups.

**Region A:** Mr. Satterwhite had nothing new to report.

**Region B:** Mr. Campsey said the next Region B meeting is October 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Region F:** Mr. Everheart said Region F has submitted their completed 2016 regional water management plan.

**Region G:** Mr. McClendon said there has been a great deal of discussion regarding an off-channel reservoir project. Many local residents do not support the project as it would impact land that has been in their families for a hundred years or more. The alternative is groundwater use—but that creates a conflict with the modeled available groundwater (MAG) and a neighboring regional water planning group. There is concern that this conflict would result in an incomplete water management plan. Because of this, folks who want funding for projects would not be able to obtain it. Region G officials are still trying to find the best solution to the problem.

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

Chairman Brown then called for public inputs and comments.

##### **Ms. Amber Blount:**

Amber Blount, manager of the Sandy Land UWCD, said the district still makes low-interest agricultural water conservation loans to producers. She believes that producers will replace older irrigation equipment with new, more efficient equipment if the district can provide a lower interest rate. She believes that this helps with water conservation.

Mr. Ellison commented that Sandy Land UWCD is one of the few groundwater conservation districts that still offer the program. He said the USDA-NRCS EQIP program has curtailed much of the agricultural water conservation equipment loan programs. Ms. Blount asked if maintenance to replace an older center pivot would be eligible for SWIFT funding. Ms. Backhouse said that maintenance projects would not be eligible for SWIFT—but might be for other funding. The project would need to show an increase in water supply or demand reduction in order to qualify for SWIFT funding.

**Mr. Kelly Young:**

Mr. Young said it is important for the regional water planning group to understand the difference between public and private. Some irrigation in the state is done with public water supplies on private land. Groundwater is privately owned.

He said it is important for the group to designate the difference between public property and private property—especially as it relates to groundwater.

Mr. Young referenced remarks made by Mr. Ellison and Mr. Everheart at the last meeting. Mr. Ellison had asked how it was fair that Mr. Young had more water in one section than he had on five sections. Mr. Young said it is fair because his father and grandfather had purchased these groundwater rights. Mr. Ellison purchased what he purchased.

Mr. Young added that the United States and Texas Constitutions are designed to protect individual private property rights from groups, such as Region O, which “would get together and try to take those rights away.” Mr. Ellison is one of the agriculture representatives on the planning group—but Mr. Young says that Mr. Ellison does not represent his interests.

Like Mr. Ellison, Mr. Young said he wants his children to be able to farm or do whatever they want with their private property. Most of all, he wants them to have the individual rights that were bought and paid for in blood and money.

Mr. Young said he is not a water user group. He is a private individual property rights landowner with individual rights that are constitutionally guaranteed.

He concluded by saying it was a privilege to meet Director Jackson earlier this summer. He believes she is a very genuine person with a genuine heart. In his opinion, most of his comments fall upon deaf ears—and he is stating his opinions expressly for her.

**16. Consider Other Business And Announcements.**

Chairman Brown asked the group if there were any additional business or announcements. There was none.

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

The next regular meeting of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group will be at 10:00 a.m., November 12, 2015 at the HPWD office.

**18. Adjournment.**

Chairman Brown adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.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 November 12, 2015 regular meeting of the Llano Estacado Regional Water Planning Group.*