

Groundwater Management Area #1 Meeting

Minutes

November 2, 2016

The Groundwater Management Area Number 1 (GMA #1) met on Wednesday, November 2, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in the PRPC Board Room, 415 SW 8th Avenue, Amarillo, Texas with the following members in attendance:

Voting Members Present:

Jim Haley, Hemphill County Underground Water Conservation District, Bob Zimmer, North Plains Groundwater Conservation District, Lynn Tate, High Plains Underground Water Conservation District and Danny Hardcastle, Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District

Other Groundwater Management Area 1 Representatives Present at Table:

Janet Guthrie, Hemphill County Underground Water Conservation District, Steve Walthour, North Plains Groundwater Conservation District, Jason Coleman, High Plains Underground Water Conservation District and C.E. Williams, Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District

Guests Present: Robert Bradley, Bill Mullican, Gene Born, Dale Hallmark, Keith Good, Mike Beauchamp, Ray Brady, Randy Kliewer, Monique Norman, Kent Satterwhite, Jessica Mitchell, Kathrine Drurey

Staff Present:

Kyle Ingham, Local Government Services Director; Dustin Meyer, Local Government Services Program Coordinator

1. **Call to Order – Welcome**

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. with Chairman Zimmer presiding. Chairman Zimmer welcomed and thanked everyone for coming to the meeting.

2. **Roll Call/Introductions/Quorum**

Chairman Zimmer asked Mr. Ingham to conduct roll call. Mr. Ingham conducted roll call and established that a quorum was present.

3. **Opening Pledge**

4. **Public Comment** – Member of the general public may speak for 3 minutes on topics related to GMA#1 activities though the GMA#1 membership may not discuss or take action on any items not included on this agenda.

Chairman Zimmer opened the floor for public comments. No public comments were received at the meeting.

5. **Discuss and Consider** - The Minutes from October 5, 2016 GMA #1 Meeting.

The minutes were considered. Mr. Haley asked if Mr. Born spelled his name with and e. Mr. Born confirmed that he did not. Chairman Zimmer pointed out that in the guest's present section Jacob Reed was listed twice. Mr. Walthour pointed out that "Shumate" is

misspelled in the guest's present section. No other corrections were noted. Mr. Tate made a motion to approve minutes as corrected, seconded by Mr. Hardcastle. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Discuss and Consider** – Updated GAM Runs developed by INTERA, Inc. relevant to the Aquifers in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area

Mr. Walthour stated that there are two handouts from the GAM runs Intera had conducted on the DFC's. Mr. Walthour explained that the handouts are a breakdown of storage in each of the districts with the DFC's in place. He continued that some DFC's are broken down as a percentage remaining in 50 years and some are based on a draw down. Mr. Walthour further stated that these charts give a comparison of storage left in the future for each DFC. He goes on to explain that the charts allow the reader to see percentage remaining in the aquifer based on year's compared. Mr. Walthour stated that at the request of the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), the chart starts the last year of the calibrated model which is 2012. Mr. Hardcastle added that the data reflects DFC's as proposed and the relationship of the DFC's across geopolitical lines. Mr. Walthour agreed that the information is a snapshot of hydrologic conditions within the region based on the current draw down and DFC's to get estimated amounts for future dates (up to 2062).

Mr. Walthour explained that the next handout is a summary of the GMA#1 DFC's as proposed and a snapshot of the aquifer based on the DFC's. Mr. Walthour further explained the handout in detail including each of the categories contained in the chart. He stated that direct recharge does not change regardless of how much water is pumped from the aquifer based on DFC's. Mr. Walthour continued that wells provide an estimate of the pumping from the aquifer and that this number starts at what the TWDB reports is being pumped. Mr. Walthour continued explaining the displayed charts. Mr. Walthour explained each of the categories and how the numbers were derived. Mr. Walthour went into detail discussing lateral flow and how water comes into and out of the respective GCDs. Mr. Walthour also explained cross formational flow and how it goes into other aquifers. He stated that in the North Plains District there is cross formational flow with both the Rita Blanca and Dockum aquifers receive flow from the Ogallala Aquifer. He further stated that due to this fact, they believe when you pump the Ogallala then you are affecting both the Rita Blanca and Dockum Aquifers. Mr. Walthour stated that over a period of time, water in streams, springs and rivers will continue to dry up and eventually switch the direction of flow.

Mr. Hardcastle asked about the lateral inflow amounts in North Plains and Panhandle Districts and where the water was coming from. Mr. Walthour explained that this was a net number and that the lateral movement is a net number and could be coming from North Plains, New Mexico or other neighboring areas/counties. Mr. Hardcastle stated that it is harder to see in Panhandle GCD as compared to the High Plains District. Following this there were some discussions on lateral flow. Mr. Williams stated that the storage numbers look different than the other sheet and questioned where they come from. Mr. Walthour stated that Neil Deeds ran the numbers from the High Plains model. Mr. Williams asked if this gives value to the explanatory report. Mr. Walthour says that the value of the explanatory report is that it explains long term effects of the DFC's on aquifer conditions. Mr. Williams stated that with correct numbers it may be beneficial to include, but he is unsure whether it would be wise to include these numbers presented. Mr. Walthour then said that he agrees there could be mistakes and will have the 2015 numbers checked, but is sure that 2020-2070 is correct. Mr. Walthour also explained that the numbers should balance out, as necessary in a water budget. Mr. Walthour went

on to explained how the water storage number is taken into account in the water budget. There was some discussion among the group on the water storage budget. Chairman Zimmer asked if another column was needed representing available water to simplify the chart. Mr. Walthour stated that was the purpose of the first chart. Mr. Walthour said he would confirm the 2015 numbers are correct because they look incorrect. Mr. Hardcastle stated that the 2015 numbers do not just come out of storage. Mr. Walthour agreed stating that this is a great reflection of what actually would be happening if all the numbers for 2015 are correct. Mr. Hardcastle added that if this is added to the explanatory report, the 2015 figures should be noted as actual values while the remaining years should be noted as projected pumping to limit confusion. Ms. Guthrie added that the numbers from 2016 to 2020 are also simulated usage as well.

Mr. Walthour continued that these handouts show how these DFC's will affect future "sustainability" conditions specifically for water and rivers, and outlines what is going to be left in 50 years. Mr. Hardcastle asked how this correlates to the draw down figures. Mr. Walthour explains that it is a percentage remaining in storage. Mr. Coleman added that it is the same statement just expressed or measured differently. Mr. Walthour reminded the group that these numbers are based on the model.

Mr. Walthour also presented a draft report from Intera on the model calculations and design. The draft report presented shows calculations including average, drawdown, and available groundwater in the Ogallala from the High Plains Model run. Mr. Walthour pointed out that the draft report also covers the same information for the Dockum Aquifer. Mr. Walthour stated that he believes it is much harder to get the water out of the Dockum Aquifer than these numbers reflect and that the presented numbers do not include economic viability. Mr. Walthour stated that once the explanatory report is complete he will send it to Intera for them to review.

7. **Discuss and Consider** – Adoption of Desired Future Conditions for Aquifers in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area.

Mr. Walthour stated that on May 13, 2016 the 90 day public comment period began. Mr. Haley asked if the handout present is the same as the previous one reviewed. Mr. Walthour agreed stating that the report in the packet is what was considered at the previous meeting. The new handout has some new additions received from the Panhandle GCD. Mr. Keith Good stated that these are administrative changes and that there was a typo in the 5th paragraph and should read public hearing(s). Mr. Walthour stated that he and Mr. Good were content with the proposed changes. The Chairman stated that the handout with the changes is the one for consideration today. Ms. Guthrie asked if her comments were included in the resolution. Mr. Walthour responded that he didn't receive any comments from her, but they may have been picked up in the last draft. Mr. Williams asked if any of the comments provided were included. Mr. Walthour stated that none of them were included. Mr. Tate stated that the High Plains GCD needed a Number 1 in front of it.

The group reviewed the presented resolution and made changes including updating the dates to include the current meeting throughout the document. The group discussed editorial changes for consistency. The group reviewed the comments provided by Mr. Mullican. The group decided not to make a change related to the first comment concerning irrigated agriculture. The second comment, regarding alphabetical arrangement of counties, was adopted into the resolution. The group discussed the third comment regarding the High Plains GCD 20 foot draw down and if it is for each county

or collectively. High Plains agreed to leave it as is. Mr. Walthour asked Mr. Bradley if it was o.k. or needed further clarification concerning this comment. Mr. Mullican clarified that this comment stems from work with GMA#14 where modelers are using the resolution and have trouble if it is not explicitly clear in the resolution. The group agreed to add the word collectively to clarify the High Plains DFC statement. The change was made throughout the resolution for consistency. The change was also made to the North Plains DFC statement for consistency. Panhandle GCD did not incorporate the change in their DFC statement as the DFC is applied on a county-by-county basis.

The group continued reviewing the supplied comments. The group discussed Appendix B, being the explanatory report, and if it should come after the adoption of the resolution and not included as part of the resolution. The group agreed no appendices were needed. Chairman Zimmer called a five minute break at 11:20 a.m. The meeting was called back to order at 11:26 a.m. Mr. Coleman stated that during the break the wording of the 50 years was changed to be consistent with all of the proposed DFCs. The group reviewed the edited resolution. Mr. Walthour stated that the group is required to attach the notices of the meeting.

Mr. Hardcastle motioned to approve resolution 2016-2 to adopt the DFCs, seconded by Mr. Tate. Motion passed unanimously.

8. **Receive, Discuss, and Consider** – Explanatory Report to be submitted to TWDB associated in conjunction with the Desired Future Conditions to be adopted by the GMA#1 and other required materials and establish process for submitting comments by individual District Representatives.

Mr. Walthour stated that he appreciated all the comments and discussion from the group. He received comments from all the GCD's and have tried to include them in the explanatory report. Mr. Walthour stated that there are some further changes that still need to be incorporated. He continued that Mr. Mullican also provided several comments. Mr. Walthour continued that there were two draft explanatory reports presented for the group. One that included comments and one with the changes incorporated into the document. Mr. Walthour stated that he wants to go through the explanatory report again and that the report needs some final edits. Mr. Walthour continued that after one final edit the document needed to go back to the districts again for further review.

Mr. Hardcastle asked if there is a way to allow the group to continue with this process without having to have another meeting. Mr. Ingham stated that the group could make a motion to allow managers to work on the explanatory report without substantive material changes within the 30 day timeline. Mr. Walthour added that he does not anticipate adding anything other than the handouts presented from Mr. Neil Deeds with Intera.

Mr. Haley asked for the group to review page 51 of the explanatory report. Mr. Walthour explained that this was a recommendation from Mr. Mullican. The group discussed the edit on page 51 and Ms. Guthrie stated it was not their intent to consider 100% of the DFC. The group discussed and considered this revised comment. Mr. Bradley stated that using 100% is a bookend and is on either side of what was adopted.

Mr. Mullican stated that the explanatory report is to explain the approved DFC resolution. He continued that in his opinion if it doesn't change the resolution than it wouldn't be considered a substantive change. Mr. Walthour stated that the final copy of the

explanatory report will include everyone's comments at one time so that the group can considered everything.

Chairman Zimmer asked if there needs to be a record of agreement by the districts. Mr. Mullican stated that the state water plan gets revised for 90 days and is never reconsidered once it is approved. Mr. Bradley pointed out that they have already done what is required by statute.

Motion was made by Mr. Tate to authorize the submission by the administrator of the DFC's explanatory report subject to unanimous agreement by all managers of non-substantive revisions. The Motion was seconded by Mr. Haley and approved unanimously.

9. **Discuss** – Each GCD in GMA #1 may provide updates on new developments in process to amend management plans and rules necessary to achieve the various adopted Desired Future Conditions.

Mr. Hardcastle stated that the Panhandle GCD was in the process of holding meetings for application of their rules and draw down. Mr. Haley stated that the Hemphill County UWCD will start the process for their management plan in January.

10. **Discuss and Consider** – Scheduling of the Next Meetings of the GMA#1

The group agreed that the consideration of future GMA#1 meeting will be discussed at a future time. Mr. Hardcastle asked about the timeline to finalize submission of the DFC and explanatory report. Mr. Walthour explained that the explanatory report will be put together within the next 60 days and that the districts will adopt DFC's relevant to them. Mr. Bradley added that once it is deemed administratively complete then the GCD's adopt them. Mr. Walthour stated that the next meeting will be annual, and it is not defined meaning it can be any time in the next calendar year.

11. **Adjournment**

Meeting was called adjourned at 12:01 p.m.