

## PANHANDLE WATER PLANNING GROUP

### Minutes

March 24, 2006

A meeting of the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) was held on Friday , March 24, 2006 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:

Charles Cooke, TCW Supply, Inc.; Jim Derington, Palo Duro River Authority; Janet Guthrie, Hemphill County UWCD; Gale Henslee, Xcel Energy; Denise Jett, Phillips Petroleum; Steve Jones, Texas Department of Agriculture; David Landis, City of Perryton; Temple McKinnon, Texas Water Development Board; Charles Munger, TPWD; Kent Satterwhite, Canadian River Municipal Water Authority; Stefan Schuster, Freese & Nichols, Inc.; Grady Skaggs; John Williams; C.E. Williams, Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District

#### MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mickey Black, USDA-NRCS; Richard Bowers, North Plains Groundwater Conservation District; Inge Brady; Nolan Clark, USDA-ARS; Dan Coffey, City of Amarillo; Vernon Cook, County of Roberts; B.A. Donelson, First State Bank; Rusty Gilmore, Rita Blanca Well Service; Bill Hallerberg; Bobbie Kidd, City of Clarendon; John Sweeten, Texas Ag. Experiment Station - TAMU Ag. Res. & Ext; Rudie Tate; Janet Tregellas; Ben Weinheimer, Texas Cattle Feeders Association

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

Jack Foote, Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board; Simone Kiel, Freese & Nichols, Inc.; Cindy Cockerham, Senator Kel Seliger's Office; Bridget Guerrero, TCE; Cleon Namken

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Chris Coffman, Local Government Services Program Director; Janice Reece, PRPC Administrative Assistant

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

Seven Designated Alternates were recognized: Amy Crowell representing Vernon Cook; Tommy Powell representing Rudie Tate; Jim Powell representing Janet Tregellas; Fran Bretz representing Nolan Clark; Lloyd Pippin representing Inge Brady; Cole Camp representing Rusty Gilmore; and Chris Sharp representing Richard Bowers.

3. **MINUTES**

David Landis made the motion to accept the minutes from the meeting held on December 21, 2005 as presented. Grady Skaggs seconded the motion; motion carried by unanimous vote.

4. **DISCUSS, REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPROVING THE FINAL CHANGES OF THE 2006 REGION A PANHANDLE REGIONAL WATER PLAN AS PRESENTED AND CONSIDER ANY ADDITIONAL CHANGES**

Simone Kiel and Stefan Schuster gave an overview of the PWPG Revision Update, changes in the IPP and Final Plan.

In the first draft, under source availability - the Ogallala Aquifer, the Plan distinguished between county-wide supplies and developed supplies to water users and the 1.25% availability on a county-wide basis. Shortages observed in the GAM were applied at the user level i.e., irrigation in Hartley and Hutchinson Counties, manufacturing in Hutchinson County and CRMWA supplies in Roberts County. Changes (made in the Plan) to the *Ogallala Supplies* resulted in slightly increased needs for irrigation in Hutchinson and Hartley Counties, eliminated needs for Borger and eliminated needs for livestock in Hutchinson County, and resulted in shortages for CRMWA and customers, including Amarillo and customers.

In the first draft, under source availability - the Seymour Aquifer, the GAM indicated greater pumpage could be maintained and not exceed 1.25% policy and revised Seymour county-wide availabilities based on GAM pumpage. Changes (made in the Plan) to the *Seymour Aquifer Supplies* resulted in increased supplies to Hall and Collingsworth counties and eliminated irrigation needs in Hall County.

In the first draft, under source availability - the Dockum Aquifer, updated supplies based on published 2003 TWDB report, applied 1.25% policy to county-wide availabilities and considered historical use for developed supplies. Changes (made in the Plan) to the *Dockum Aquifer* resulted in decreased needs for irrigation in Moore County, eliminated need for livestock in Randall County and slightly reduced needs for county-other in Potter and Randall Counties.

Other corrections included: revised supply allocation to reflect infrastructure constraints, other water supply sources and historical use; eliminating needs for manufacturing, mining and livestock in Carson County as well as Texline; county – other in Hansford and Hemphill Counties; mining in Potter County and Lake Tanglewood; livestock, mining and irrigation in Randall County.

Changes made to Wholesale Water Providers:

CRMWA – reduced supply from Roberts County groundwater to reflect GAM results; show additional demands from Region O (DB07 recommended strategies) for plan consistency; needs begin in 2010; added strategy to replace diminished capacity of existing well field.

Amarillo – included reuse demand from Xcel Endrgy; reduced supply from CRMWA due to reduced Roberts county groundwater; Amarillo's Roberts County well field is not connected; WWP needs begin in 2030; City of Canyon shows shortage.

Dumas – Show Palo Duro Reservoir as alternate strategy

Cactus – Show Palo Duro Reservoir as alternate strategy

PDRA – Show supply from Palo Duro Reservoir to equal firm yield and Added discussion of strategy.

In summary, Mr. Schuster said that 16 water user groups (WUGs) no longer have needs but two new WUGs now have needs (Amarillo and Canyon). There are no new strategies - - strategies to meet Amarillo and Canyon needs were previously identified. Timing and amount of strategies were adjusted. CRMWA well field was expanded. He also said that there were revisions to Database 2007 (DB07) and some text revisions. He concluded the following tasks should be completed: adopt changes, submit those changes to TWDB, Freese and Nichols, Inc. will reprint Volume 1 and selected appendices and then the PWPG should submit to TWDB for approval.

C.E. Williams thanked Stefan and Simone for the presentation and their efforts on this project. He acknowledged John Williams for the countless hours and hard work he has put into this Plan.

David Landis made the motion to adopt the Plan with changes made today. Further, that this Plan be forwarded to the TWDB by May 16, 2006. Charles Cooke seconded the motion; motion carried by unanimous vote.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **5. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE FINANCIAL REPORT**

In the absence of Nolan Clark, C.E. Williams presented the Financial Report: The PWPG has a Balance Sheet reflecting (\$119,940) as of December 31, 2005 (unaudited).

December 2005 – All Local Contributions: \$59,507.00

**Expenses By Task:**

Total Budget is 74.12% expended

PRPC – 88.46% or \$77,919.88

Freese & Nichols, Inc. – 69.67% or \$303,474.54

TAES – 67% or \$134,134.55

GW Consultant – 99.81% or \$81,646.66

Mr. Schuster noted that additional invoices would be forthcoming and the total cost should be near the budgeted amounts for FNI and the subcontractors.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Planning Group, the meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.