

## PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

### Minutes

October 27, 2005

A meeting of the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) was held on Thursday, October 27, 2005, at 1:30 p.m. in the PRPC Board Room, 415 West Eighth Avenue, Amarillo, Potter County, Texas.

Mr. C.E. Williams, Chairman, presided.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Richard Bowers, North Plains Ground Water Conservation District; Dan Coffey, City of Amarillo; Vernon Cook, County of Roberts; Charles Cooke, TCW Supply, Inc.; Rusty Gilmore, Rita Blanca Well Service; Janet Guthrie, Hemphill County UWCD; Gale Henslee, Xcel Energy; Denise Jett, ConocoPhillips Petroleum; Steve Jones, Texas Department of Agriculture; Temple McKinnon, Texas Water Development Board; Charles Munger, TWPD Canyon Fisheries Lab; Kent Satterwhite, CRMWA; Grady Skaggs, County of Oldham; John Sweeten, Texas Ag. Experiment Station - TAMU Ag. Res. & Ext; Rudie Tate, ; Ben Weinheimer, TCFA; John Williams, Canadian River Municipal Water Authority; C.E. Williams, Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mickey Black, USDA-NRCS; Inge Brady; Nolan Clark, USDA-ARS; Jim Derington, Palo Duro River Authority; B.A. Donelson, First State Bank; William Hallerberg; Bobbie Kidd, Greenbelt Municipal & Industrial Water Authority; David Landis, City of Perryton; Janet Tregellas

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

Fran Bretz, TAES; Steve Stevens, Mesa Water; Cole Camp; Steve Amoson, Texas Agricultural Extension Service

## STAFF PRESENT:

Chris Coffman, Local Government Services Director; Marcus Smith, Local Government Services Program Specialist; Janice Reece, Support Staff

### 1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. C. E. Williams called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and noted that a quorum was present.

### 2. **ESTABLISH ATTENDANCE & RECOGNIZE DESIGNATED ALTERNATES**

Four Designated Alternates were recognized: Jim Powell representing David Landis; Thomas Marek representing Nolan Clark; Lloyd Pippin representing Inge Brady and Obie Kelly representing Mickey Black.

### 3. **MINUTES**

Charles Cooke made the motion to accept the minutes as presented. Richard Bowers seconded the motion; motion carried by unanimous vote.

### 4. **DISCUSS, CONSIDER AND REVIEW THE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE INITIALLY PREPARED PLAN**

Stefan Schuster, Freese & Nichols, Inc. reviewed a spreadsheet containing each comment which had been received by the Planning Group regarding the IPP. A copy of the comments had been mailed to the members of the Planning Group in their agenda packet the previous week. He went through each comment and explained; then in turn asked for discussion. Further, he stated that after changes and corrections, Plan will be submitted for approval and adoption at the next meeting of the Planning Group.

Mr. Schuster stated that there were some comments on formatting, grammar and spelling changes which will of course be made to the final draft. The following are some issues discussed:

- John Williams expressed concern regarding the strategies for CRMWA. He said that in order for CRMWA to continue to meet the needs of its customers, the Plan should spell that any funding assistance needed will be made available. Mr. Schuster said that currently the intent is to expand the well field in order to meet the numbers.
- Charles Munger addressed the issue of stream designation and said that this is an issue of irrelevant designation
- John Sweeten stated that on the subject of brush control, the Planning Group needs more specifics.
- Obie Kelly stated that NRCS has guidelines (standard specifications) for brush control. He suggested that language from these could be used in the IPP.

- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, the PWPG has already included voluntary transfers in the Plan.
- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, the PWPG will include information on overall shortages predicted.
- C.E. Williams stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, on the issuance of term permits for Mesa Water, Inc., the answer is, “terms are the same for everyone”.
- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, to the issue of the PWPG’s criteria for designating major springs - - the answer is, “the Texas Handbook, ‘what is a major or minor spring?’”
- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, Table 1-13 will be reconfigured.
- John Williams suggested that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club include data on the de-listing of the Arkansas River Shiner.
- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, each county page has tourism information.
- Stefan Schuster stated that in response to the National Wildlife Federation, Environmental Defense and Sierra Club, further explanation regarding the rationale underlying the decision to use only well data that showed lower elevations for the base of the aquifer and disregard those data that indicate higher elevations, Schuster will confer with Dr. Dutton to see if changes are significant to warrant a change.
- Temple McKinnon stated that in regard to drought contingency, i.e., conservation and drought management - - the question arises, “how can groundwater meet surface water requirements?”

5. **GENERAL STATUS UPDATE; PLAN DEVELOPMENT ON TASKS 9, 10, TEXAS A & METERING REPORT, SURFACE WATER RESERVOIRS AND AVAILABILITY REPORTS**

Dr. Steve Amoson discussed his role in acquiring a direct correlation between depletion of the aquifer and irrigation. His effort was to take an outside look and make suggestions. He looked at water use by crop, soil type, irrigation systems and associated yields. This proved irrelevant because producers were growing several crops. This skewed the data by making it impossible to isolate individual crop and its water usage. A staff of six people worked with this data and analyzed records to 10%.

The most significant finding was that there were some malfunctioning meters and some wrong readings.

Dr. Amoson said that basically the data is getting better but data collection is very intense and beyond the resources of the water districts. At this time it is his opinion that there is not enough data to execute this project.

Dr. Amoson recommended that the water districts monitor once per year and select the meters that can be isolated by crop.

6. **DISCUSS AND CONSIDER THE TIMELINE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE FINAL PLAN**

C.E. Williams presented a spreadsheet depicting the tasks to be completed and deadlines for each. Unfinished items remaining are a December PWPG meeting, approval and adoption of the Regional Water Plan and submission of the Plan to the Texas Water Development Board.

7. **REVIEW AND APPROVE FINANCIAL PLAN**

C.E. Williams presented the Independent Financial Report with a balance sheet ending \$48,801 for the Panhandle Water Planning Group. He provided a review of the financial documents as submitted by the PRPC. Charles Cook made a motion to approve of the financial activities of the PWPG. Vernon Cook seconded the motion; motion carried by unanimous vote

**OTHER BUSINESS**

A. The next meeting of the PWPG will be on Thursday, December 1, 2005.

B. Chairman Williams stated that the terms of Nolan Clark, David Landis, Janet Guthrie, Grady Skaggs, John Sweeten, Rudie Tate and Janet Tregellas are ending. He thanked them for their service and asked that they consider serving another term. The PWPG will vote on filling those seats at the next meeting.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Planning Group, the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.