

Groundwater Management Area #1 Meeting

Minutes

November 6, 2014

The Groundwater Management Area Number 1 (GMA #1) met on Thursday November 6, 2014, 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, Floyd Hartman, Danny Krienke, James Beach, Ray Brady, Josh Winegarner, Dale Hallmark, Jessica Mitchell, Gene Born, Kent Satterwhite, Keith Good, Kirk Welch, Bill Mullican, Dee Vaughan, Korri Packard, Mike Beauchamp, Jeff Ammosen

Staff Present:

Kyle Ingham, Local Government Services Director; Dustin Meyer, Local Government Services Specialist; Joe Price, Local Government Services Program Specialist

1. Call to Order - Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. with Chairman Zimmer presiding.

2. Roll Call and Introductions

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

3. Opening Pledge

4. Public Comment

Chairman Zimmer opened the floor for public comments. Chairman Zimmer noted that a letter was previously sent in by Mr. James Adams and is part of the public comment record.

5. Discuss and Consider - Minutes from August 19, 2014, GMA #1 Meeting.

Mr. Krienke stated that in the minutes his name was mistakenly put down as having seconded a motion to schedule the next meeting. Mr. Hardcastle stated that he seconded the motion for next meeting. Mr. Tate made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected and Mr. Haley seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Discuss and Consider – Action as may be necessary in regards GMA #1 Officers and Membership.

Mr. Ingham stated that the current slate of officers of, Mr. Zimmer as Chair, Mr. Haley as Vice Chair, and Mr. Tate as Secretary, has all agreed to reaffirm their positions. Mr. Ingham stated that Mr. Haley is the only officer that has been in the position longer than a year. He continued that there is a four year term limit; however none of the current officers are against the term limit. Mr. Hardcastle made a motion to keep the current slate of officers as is. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haley. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Discuss and Consider – Appointment of GMA #1 representative to the Panhandle Water Planning Group (Region A – Regional Water Planning)

Mr. Ingham stated that Senate Bill 660 out of the 82nd legislature added a GMA representative to the water planning group for each region. He continued that GMA#1 sits entirely within the Panhandle Water Planning Group's boundaries and that the position is currently held by Mr. Krienke. Mr. Krienke is from the North Plains Groundwater Conservation District and has held the position in 2013 and 2014 and is a former chairman of GMA#1. Mr. Ingham stated that the group can vote to reappoint Mr. Krienke as the GMA#1 representative to the Panhandle Water Planning Group, or receive nominations from the floor and consider any of those nominations. Mr. Haley motioned to reappoint Mr. Krienke as the GMA#1 representative to the Panhandle Water Planning Group. The motion was second by Mr. Tate. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Discuss and Consider – Action as may be necessary in regard to administrative services for GMA #1 through the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Ingham stated that going back to 2008, the GMA#1 is comprised of four ground water conservation districts and that those districts came together under statute to begin the GMA process. In 2008, GMA#1 requested the Panhandle Regional Planning Commission (PRPC) to serve in an administrative capacity. Mr. Ingham stated that PRPC had been serving in a similar capacity to the Panhandle Water Planning Group since 1997 and agreed to administer the GMA process as well. He continue that PRPC is happy to continue this service if it is the will of the GMA#1. Mr. Ingham also stated that rate structure went up from \$55 per hour to \$60 per hour, which is the first rate increase since 2008. Mr. Ingham continued that administrative services include preparation of meetings, assistance in development of agenda packets, fulfilling secretary of state requirements with regards to Texas Open Meetings Act in publishing notices, and maintaining Texas Public Records. Mr. Tate requested Mr. Ingham to explain how payment is divided among the districts. Mr. Ingham stated that an invoice is created that shows the total amount charged to the GMA#1 program during the quarter and that invoice is then split evenly among the four Ground Water Conservation Districts. Each district is responsible for a quarter of the cost incurred over a 3 month period. Mr. Walthour stated that in his opinion it has been a great experience working with PRPC and he believed that someone other than a GCD is needed to carry out the administrative function. Mr. Tate made a motion to renew the administration contract with PRPC. Mr. Hardcastle seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

9. Receive and Discuss – Presentation from the City of Amarillo regarding the City's water related activities as a water producer and user in GMA#1.

Floyd Hartman Assistant Director of Utilities for the City of Amarillo made a presentation regarding Amarillo's water related activities as a water producer and user in GMA#1. He stated that the City of Amarillo has multiple strategies in water conservation and work hand-in-hand with the Ground Water Conservation Districts to meet the expectations for the Desired Future Conditions. He continued that Amarillo is currently reclaiming an

average of 4.4 billion gallons of water each year through efforts with Excel Energy for electric generation. Mr. Hartman stated that another effort that has a positive impact on the aquifers is the tiered rate structure. Mr. Hartman reviewed the rate structure for the City of Amarillo and stated that the Amarillo City Council is very progressive and sensitive to water conservation issues. Mr. Hartman stated that another effort recently approved by the Amarillo City Council is an internal crew for leak repair and replacing old 2" and 3" water mains. He continued that the City also has a water conservation team headed by the other Assistant Director of Utilities, Tim Loan, who is responsible for conducting public outreach on conservation issues. Mr. Hartman stated that the Amarillo City Council has recently upgraded the landscape ordinance to include nonliving ground cover and other water saving measures. He continued that the landscape ordinance applies to commercial properties, but that the City offers incentives to residential areas as well. Mr. Hartman stated that Amarillo also participates in a Well Head Protection Program, which helps to ensure protection of the aquifers and quality of water for everything the City owns. He continued that the Well Head Protection Program is successful and in the last year over 50 staff members have received training through the program. He also stated that the City works actively with customers to reduce water waste.

Mr. Hartman then presented a graph showing the City of Amarillo water supply by source. Mr. Hartman discussed the City of Amarillo's usage of different well fields and how they manage reliance from each source. He stated that there is an ongoing strategy to minimize reliance on local wells in the aquifers and stretch out the production. Mr. Hartman continued that when combined with reclaimed water the City of Amarillo is having a big impact. He emphasized that the 4.4 billion gallons of water per year saved from reclaimed water is enough water to last the City of Amarillo from January 1st to mid April. Mr. Hartman stated that through the City of Amarillo's water conservation efforts he believes they are having a lot of success on minimizing the overall impact on the aquifers and on meeting the objectives of the TWDB and the Conservation Districts.

Ms. Guthrie asked if Mr. Hartman would expand on the Well Head Protection Program. Mr. Hartman responded that it is a very comprehensive program and includes sanitary control easements, fencing, security and monitoring systems, but mostly deals with what is on the surface and protecting the aquifers by protecting the area around the wells. He continued that the program ensures against infiltration inflows by making sure that well heads are constructed properly and maintained. Ms. Guthrie followed up asking if the City had the ability to put zoning restrictions around well heads in the city limits or if TCEQ had adequate standards to buffer wells. Mr. Hartman stated that the current practice is to create a sanitary control easement around new wells. In situations in which a well doesn't have a sanitary control easement, the City will try and go back and get one when doing repairs and things of that nature. He continued, in all cases the City of Amarillo's current practice is to maintain the standards of a sanitary control easement even in situation where they don't have one and that was one of the primary objectives of the Well Head Protection Program.

Mr. Haley asked if Mr. Hartman was comfortable in utilizing his numbers for the joint planning purposes. Mr. Hartman answered in affirmative, stating that some numbers may differ only because in certain situation the numbers are reported by fiscal year as opposed to physical year. Mr. Haley asked Mr. Hartman to address water loss audit numbers, more specifically if there was any interaction with areas such as Lubbock or Plainview who are also utilizing the CRMWA system and how water loss audit plans are implemented. Mr. Hartman answered that the water loss audit is strictly implemented based on TWDB and TCEQ. Mr. Hartman stated that the City of Amarillo's audit is very

good and demonstrates that the City does not lose a lot of water; however he could not speak to how other cities do the water loss audit. Mr. Tate followed up asking how many wells Amarillo had in the southwest well field. Mr. Hartman stated that there were 45 wells in the Southwest field and most of those are in the High Plains District. Mr. Hardcastle asked what the city's rules are for drilling private wells within City limits. Mr. Hartman stated that they were allowed. Mr. Hardcastle followed up asking if Mr. Hartman knew what, if any, were the production limits of those private wells in City limits. Mr. Hartman stated that he was only aware of two wells that exceeded the 25,000 gallon production limit. Mr. Tate questioned whether the city was satisfied with the permitting of those wells or if anything needs to be changed. Mr. Hartman stated that he was not aware of any issues with private property wells. Mr. Hardcastle asked if the City of Amarillo provided water outside city limits. Mr. Hartman stated that the City does provide water outside the city limits, but on a limited basis and it involves an application process. Residential applicants must agree to annexation if the City supplies their water or if they cross their property with a pipeline. Mr. Hartman explained that users outside the city limits are primarily industrial and that Tyson is the biggest user the City of Amarillo provides to outside the city limits. Mr. Hardcastle asked what happens to the reclaimed water, more specifically, if it goes back into the system. Mr. Hartman explained that Excel Energy must discard the reclaimed water through their treatment process and none of it is allowed to go back into the system. Mr. Hartman continued that Excel typically gets 4 to 6 cycles of use from reclaimed water before they dispose of it. Chairman Zimmer asked if all of the City of Amarillo wells come from Ogallala formation. Mr. Hartman answered that in the Southwest well field there are about five wells in the Dockum formation. Chairman Zimmer followed up asking what the per capita use is and how does it compare to other cities in the state. Mr. Hartman answered that the City of Amarillo is a little higher than other areas. He stated that the per capita use is above 200 but did not know the exact numbers. Ms. Guthrie asked if the high per capita was due to industrial use. Mr. Williams stated that it is very difficult to come up with an accurate reflection of per capita use excluding industrial and reclaimed water, however TCEQ and TWDB is trying to develop a method to accurately report numbers excluding industry. Chairman Zimmer asked if future plans include more wells in the Dockum formation. Mr. Hartman answered that future wells in the Dockum formation is a secondary plan and the primary goal is to expand their other areas first. Ms. Guthrie asked if there was a timeline on future new well development. Mr. Hartman answered that the current goal was to add a new well every few years in Carson County to maintain production and will consider growth demand to look at expansion in other areas. Mr. Haley asked how the quality is between the various well fields. Mr. Hartman answered that there is outstanding quality on all parts and the only difference would be from wells within the Dockum that have higher chlorides. He continued that there were no issues with quality from the various well fields in the Ogallala formation.

Chairman Zimmer asked if Mr. Hartman was aware of anything from the City of Amarillo that would need to be planned for by the GMA#1 that would have an impact on the DFC. Mr. Hartman answered that in the short-term there was not. Mr. Tate asked if short-term was defined as within the next 5 years. Mr. Hartman stated that it was more like 10 years from a funding perspective. Chairman Zimmer stated that to his knowledge the City of Amarillo is using around 45,000 acre feet per year. He asked how much that usage increases on average year-to-year. Mr. Hartman stated that the City of Amarillo uses 16 billion gallons and that use and expansion will match population growth. He continued that if there is substantial growth in the industrial sector, usage will exceed population growth. Mr. Hartman stated that the City of Amarillo's population growth is about 1.5%. Ms. Guthrie asked about the City of Amarillo's policy with regards to

drought conditions especially considering Ogallala as the primary source. Mr. Hartman stated that the City of Amarillo takes a very proactive approach and relies heavily on an educational approach as opposed to a reactive approach. Ms. Guthrie asked if the City uses drought indicators or other factors. Mr. Hartman answered that the drought triggers were update in 2010 and were set high. He continued that recently the drought triggers were lowered to 75% of daily production. Mr. Hartman continued that the drought contingency ranges from voluntary in stage 1 to enforcement in stage 5. Ms. Guthrie asked if there was enough voluntary involvement. Mr. Hartman said he believed the public is reactive to the message. He elaborated that the biggest driving force on water demand is temperature. Chairman Zimmer clarified that the only enforcement is in stage 5. Mr. Hartman answered in affirmation. Mr. Hardcastle asked what had the most impact on conservation strategies. Mr. Hartman answered he believed the tiered rate structure had the most impact and that the impact could be seen. Mr. Haley asked if there were lots of users and homes that can get by on the minimum. Mr. Hartman stated that there was a significant number and that the rate structure allows for low income and people in need. Ms. Guthrie asked if the sewer was tiered as well. Mr. Hartman answered that it was not, but that residential and commercial rates are different.

10. Receive, Discuss and Consider – Presentation regarding the impact on the interests and rights in private property, including ownership and the rights of management area landowners and their lessees and assigns in groundwater as recognized under Texas Water Code 36.002. {Texas Water Code 36.108 (d)(7)}

Chairman Zimmer stated that item 10 is postponed at this time and that the Council needed to work together a little bit longer to get this item prepared. He continued that the group would like to wait for the preliminary data from the new model to come out and that the group was not prepared to make the presentation for this agenda item. The group agreed to postpone agenda item 10.

11. Receive, Discuss, and Consider – The feasibility of achieving the Desired Future Condition {Texas Water Code 36.108 (d) (8)}

Mr. Walthour stated that this is number eight of the nine factors to be considered. He continued that in order to consider feasibility that they would have to compare the modeled available ground water with the DFC. Mr. Walthour continued that most districts have management plans that address the DFC and that each district has looked at the rules to implement the DFC. Mr. Walthour further stated that feasibility is open for discussion and that there are degrees of feasibility from possible to impossible. He continued that defining how feasible it will be to implement the DFC will come down to how the rules in the GCD are written and the conditions of the aquifers in each of the Districts. Ms. Guthrie asked if feasibility would involve a comparison from current production levels to the MAG. Mr. Walthour stated that it would, however the districts would have to work with each other utilizing the numbers from the MAG as well as the rules and management plans to achieve the DFC. Mr. Walthour continued that when looking at feasibility you must consider if you are setting something that is possible to achieve or something that is probable to achieve. Ms. Guthrie asked if rules can achieve the DFC then what are the criteria that need to be contained within those rules. She continued that her concern is having members of the GMA#1 vote on something that may be contingent on future rule changes. Ms. Guthrie clarified her question, asking if feasibility is what is currently in the rules or what you might need to put in the rules. Mr. Walthour stated that in reviewing the guidance from the TWDB to determine what was feasible, they considered what is reasonable. In other words, could the DFC be reasonably achieved? In some cases, Mr. Walthour continued, the TWDB said that

some of the DFC's being set were not feasible because they were not possible. Mr. Walthour stated that looking at what is reasonable is a good place to start. Ms. Guthrie asked if there are new guidelines on what TWDB standards are for feasibility. Mr. Walthour stated that Mr. Robert Bradley may be able to answer Ms. Guthrie's question. Mr. Bradley stated that no new guidelines on feasibility have been talked about by the TWDB board. Mr. Bradley also stated that one factor in determining feasibility is can the DFC be run in the model. He continued that there are lots of things to consider, however he did remind that the DFC is a 50 year timeframe and that if there is a problem, there is a 5-year window to update. Mr. Bradley continued that it is a long-term vision on whether the DFC can be achieved. Mr. Hardcastle asked if the approach should be on a district-by-district basis or as GMA#1 as a whole. Mr. Walthour stated that it should be looked at both ways, holistically as a GMA#1 and how it is going to affect a district. Mr. Williams asked if reporting was supposed to be done on a county-by-county basis not a district-by-district basis. Mr. Walthour stated that reporting on a county-by-county basis is true of the Regional Planning effort, but was not sure for the GMA#1. Chairman Zimmer stated that when considering feasibility and the rules, his vote has to be on what is known today and can't be based on what a GCD might do or may need to do. Ms. Guthrie agreed, but pointed out that it is difficult for one member to address specific issues that may arise in a GCD. Mr. Walthour asked Mr. James Beach to potentially discuss his work with other GMA's and how they handle similar issues. Mr. Beach stated the first thing to look at was what can be gained by looking at the models. He continued that the long term perspective is important because these are regional goals firstly. Mr. Beach stated that each district must decide how local they want to make the goals. Mr. Lynn asked Mr. Bradley if there is any requirement to report on a county-by-county basis. Mr. Bradley answered there was not. Chairman Zimmer stated that at the GMA#1 level their charge is to set the DFC by region and in the past three regions have been set. Mr. Walthour stated that he had no further information of feasibility until the next Modeled Available Groundwater numbers are available at which time the district can compare those to what they are doing.

12. Receive, Discuss, and Consider – Any other information relevant to Desired Future Conditions {Texas Water Code 36.108(d)(9)}

Mr. Ingham asked Mr. Bradley if this is the catch all item that doesn't fit in the other 9 items. Mr. Bradley answered in affirmation. Mr. Lynn asked if Mr. Bradley had seen other GMA's include anything under this item. Mr. Bradley stated that the only item he has seen included here is subsidence issues. Mr. Bradley reiterated that this is a place holder for any other items the group may want to include. Mr. Walthour stated that when considering other items at the end of the planning process this item can be brought back. He continued that it was mentioned today just to let the board members know that there would be an opportunity to add other relevant information. Ms. Guthrie asked if it is possible that neighboring GCD's could do something that effect GMA#1's DFC. Mr. Walthour stated that in previous round of planning it is very difficult to achieve a wide variety of DFC statements internally. Ms. Guthrie asked if the group needed to consider Oklahoma's impact on the DFC. Mr. Walthour rebutted that there is not a lot of Ogallala aquifer in New Mexico and likewise plays out fairly quickly in Oklahoma. He continued that the group does not have any data for production in the north part, but the model itself will take into account the surrounding area. Ms. Guthrie stated that hydrological growth could be stumped due to the surrounding area. Mr. Walthour responded that the model doesn't stop at the borders and is based on a data set that includes the surrounding areas.

13. Receive, Discuss and Consider – Any new developments, available data, or public comment related to the following items:

Chairman Zimmer stated that this agenda item is the previous six criteria that has already been worked on. Mr. Walthour stated that there are two different presentations under this item, one from Hemphill County Underground Water Conservation District and Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District. Ms. Guthrie introduced Ray Brady, a consultant that has been working in the district since 1995, who gave the presentation for Hemphill County UWCD. The presentation will be included in the official minutes. The presentation demonstrated the 3D visualization model of surface water which includes the Canadian River in Hemphill County. Mr. Haley asked Mr. Brady, where the city of Canadian actually loses stream flow. Mr. Brady answered that there is still some stream flow at 70%, but the amount of discharge is drastically affected. Mr. Hardcastle questioned if there is any steam flow at 60% mark. Mr. Brady answered that there was in the Canadian River, but not in Red Deer Creek. Mr. Williams commented that White Deer Creek in Roberts County was measured recently and measured at its highest point in the last 15 years. Mr. Williams continued that CRMWA moved some of the pumping from west side to east side and that may have had an effect. Mr. Brady continued with the presentation. Mr. Krienke asked what T Boone Pickens is doing on the Canadian River and if he was discharging into it. Mr. Williams stated that he was not aware of anything. Discussions ensued on what feeds into the Canadian River. Ms. Guthrie stated that the 3D model represents the surface elevation of the aquifer and the ground elevation shows the interaction between ground water and surface water. Ms. Guthrie continued that the model just reflects the loss of ground water interaction with surface water. She continued that many water level measurements were made to build the surface elevation. Ms. Guthrie elaborated on the slides from the model, explaining that the blue parts are where the water elevation exceeded the surface elevations. She continued to explain that at 80% the impact on the western edge near Roberts County can be seen; at 70%, groundwater will not be interacting at the Canadian River Bridge; and at 60%, all that is left for groundwater to interact with is surface water at the very eastern side. Ms. Guthrie clarified that this model is just an elevation comparison. Mr. Hardcastle asked if slides shown in prior meetings showing base elevation of red bed and ground water were based on different GAM runs. Mr. Hardcastle followed up asking if those slides tie into this current model. Mr. Brady explained what factors went into the GAM runs and where the data points came from. He stated that the process has been a continuing update of the red bed base. Mr. Brady further explained that the red bed data for the cross section came from Panhandle District and their own data.

Chairman Zimmer asked with each of the possible DFC's, what is the projected economic impact on the county. Ms. Guthrie stated that the impact would most likely be felt on property values and a negative impact to endangered species. She elaborated that property values are very much tied to the stream flow. Additionally, most ranchers do not have any groundwater production, mostly relying on surface water for day-to-day needs. She continued that to not expect some impact is pretty extreme especially considering the MAG numbers showing the drastic impacts from 80% to 60%. Ms. Guthrie continued that they currently don't have a MAG for 70% and may need to do more modeling for that consideration. Mr. Hardcastle asked if there is a breaking point due to elevation. He clarified his question asking if the breaking point is known considering modeling is still being developed. Ms. Guthrie answered that was correct the breaking point is still unknown. Ms. Guthrie discussed Lake Marvin and the fact that tax payers are supporting improvements to the lake as a tourist feature in Hemphill County. She continued that the GAM models show natural discharge to Hemphill at

45,000 to 47,000 acre feet per year. Ms. Guthrie stated that modeling does not have sufficient flow gauge measurements to model natural discharge better. Chairman Zimmer asked how many acre feet are currently being pumped in the county. Ms. Guthrie stated that the irrigators in the county are doing some voluntary metering and that oil and gas is a big factor. She continued that a good number is between 12,000 and 18,000. Chairman Zimmer asked what percentage is oil and gas. Ms. Guthrie stated that she believed it was about 35%. Mr. Hardcastle asked, other than oil and gas, if other large scale agriculture production was located on the southern edge. Ms. Guthrie stated that actually most is in the north management area, north of the Canadian feed yard. Ms. Guthrie explained that the eastern edge of the Ogallala starts to thin out considerably and in some areas have less than 20 feet of saturated thickness. Mr. Hardcastle clarified that the primary impact of going from 80% to 60% would be on the Canadian River. Ms. Guthrie confirmed that was correct and elaborated that other things would be impacted as well, such as the Washita River and Red Deer River. Mr. Hardcastle asked if impacts on other counties, beside Hemphill, were taken into account. Ms. Guthrie, stated that it was and they considered 5 to 10 miles outside Hemphill County depending on the data. Ms. Guthrie stated that without gauges, elevation changes are all that is going to be available. She continued that Devin Energy in now reusing water in the county for oil and gas, but that the numbers need to be refined. The reuse water is a small amount compared to irrigated agriculture in Hemphill County.

Zimmer called for a 10 minute recess. Chairman called the meeting back to order at 11:52 a.m.

14. DEVIATION ON AGENDA AT CHAIR'S DISCRETION TO ITEM 14 Discuss – Each GCD in GMA #1 will provide a status report on process to amend management plans and rules necessary to achieve the various adopted Desired Future Conditions.

Mr. Williams gave a presentation on the achievement of the DFC in the Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District. The presentation will be included in the official minutes. Mr. Williams stated that achieving the DFC is a continuation of a process that started back in 1998. He continued that they are utilizing a two tier process to achieve the DFC. First is a study area process demonstrating areas that break the annual decline more than allowed for a particular area. Mr. Williams stated that hydrographs are done on all of the 800 wells throughout the district and is what drives the process. The second area demonstrates the cumulative decline and is where the 50/50 goal is achieved. Mr. Williams continued reviewing the slides stating that the western well field in CRMWA has shown significant improvement. Mr. Williams stated that overall the PGCD is in relatively good shape. Mr. Williams continued his presentation demonstrating the numbers for Carson County. Mr. Tate asked if the numbers presented were in percentages or in feet. Mr. Williams confirmed that the numbers where in feet. Mr. Williams stated that the reason they presented information in feet is to allow people to produce dependent on what they have. Ms. Guthrie asked a question concerning how to read a chart on the presentation. Mr. Williams answered stating that the chart allows you to see long term both the annual and cumulative projections. Mr. Williams furthered that the district has a contract with Intera to generate these charts automatically. Mr. Williams continued the presentation, showing each county in the Panhandle Ground Water Conservation District on 5-year rolling averages. Mr. Williams stated that Clarendon has a thinner saturated thickness as a whole. Mr. Walthour asked how many wells are in the Clarendon area. Mr. Williams stated that he was unsure, but the district analyzes a nine square mile area and does not designate a study area or a conservation

area based on an individual well. Mr. Williams stated that the cumulative decline trigger going back to 1998 has been recalculated at 18.63%. He continued that the only area that does not meet those criteria is the CRMWA area. Mr. Williams stated that his district feels that they are more than achieving their DFC. Mr. Haley asked exactly what the 18.63% is showing. Mr. Williams answered that for 2014 that is the target number and that number changes yearly. He further explained that utilizing the starting base in 1998, each year they add to it the allowable 1.25% of what is left.

13. DEVIATION ON AGENDA AT CHAIR'S DISCRETION RETURNED TO ITEM 13 Receive, Discuss and Consider – Any new developments, available data, or public comment related to the following items:

Mr. Williams gave a presentation on the Blaine Aquifer. The presentation will be part of the official minutes. Mr. Williams stated that the presentation is what Bill Mullican and Steve Shumate have put together to designate the Blaine Aquifer as non relevant. He continued that the information has not yet been approved by the PGCD board. Mr. Williams stated that it is on the districts agenda to discuss this information and he will report back. Mr. Mullican discussed the TWDB requirements that the Blaine aquifer is non relevant he emphasized that this just means that for the purposes of joint planning. Mr. Mullican made a presentation on this requirement and talked about the administrative requirements to show it as non relevant. Mr. Walthour asked how designating the Blaine as non relevant will affect Region A going forward and if there will still be numbers from Wheeler County for the Blaine Aquifer. Mr. Mullican answered that there will still be numbers for the aquifer, but if it is designated as a separate aquifer it triggers being required to have a management plan and rules to address a small area. Mr. Williams answered that if this is shown then you have to show it like a major aquifer and for joint planning purposes they do not believe that it is relevant. Mr. Williams stated that he does not see anything that would have a negative effect on designating the Blaine as non relevant. Mr. Walthor stated that in regional water planning they must use modeled available numbers. Mr. Williams stated that those numbers will still be in the regional planning. Mr. Bradley clarified that for the non relevant aquifers when there is no DFC the regions are responsible for the availability of those areas. Mr. Williams stated that they may come back next time with a request to designate this area as non relevant.

14. DEVIATION ON AGENDA AT CHAIR'S DISCRETION RESUMED ITEM 14 Discuss – Each GCD in GMA #1 will provide a status report on process to amend management plans and rules necessary to achieve the various adopted Desired Future Conditions.

Chairman Zimmer discussed the status of the North Plains Groundwater Conservation District. He stated that they have adopted a rule change that would allow the NPGCD to reach a DFC by adding a chapter to the rules that will measure metered production on an annual basis with a trigger in 2017. He continued that if production exceeds the MAG then they review the 3-year average. Chairman Zimmer stated that if the 3-year average exceeded the MAG an adjustment is made and ultimately the annual allowable is decreased. He continued that the board has the final say to execute this plan. Chairman Zimmer continued that in order to allow producers to plan ahead and prepare, the first change would be effective in the year 2021. Mr. Walthour stated that the board uses all the hydrology that is available and sets the triggers based on pumping against the modeled available ground water numbers. He continued that the decision is made looking at the entire data set. Mr. Walthour also stated the management plan remains unchanged from the previous year.

Mr. Tate gave an update for the High Plains Underwater Conservation District. He stated that the district is in the process of amending their management plan and rules. Mr. Tate stated that they had recently received their certification for administrative completeness from TWDB with regards to the management plan.

Mr. Hardcastle reporting for the Panhandle Groundwater Conservation District, stated that the district believes that the current rules in place will achieve the 50/50 goal. He continued that the rules and plan are continually monitored each year by the well measurement and new information on saturated thickness and things of that nature will be incorporated into the plan. The management plan was complete four years ago but continually amended as necessary.

Chairman Zimmer stated that at this time his district is not triggering the MAG in either zone.

Mr. Haley for Hemphill Underground Water Conservation District stated that at this time they have the same management plan and same rules.

15. Discuss and Consider – Timelines associated with the release of the High Plains Groundwater Availability Model (GAM) under development by Intera Inc.

Mr. Walthour stated that Intera's current plans are to make an informal presentation in early 2015, however, the model will not be complete at that time. He continued that they should have some preliminary numbers at that time. Mr. Tate asked if it is anticipated that Intera would come to the meeting. Mr. Walthour answered that they would and that it is part of the contract. He continued that the model is going to be a very robust and good model when it is finished.

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

Chairman Zimmer suggested scheduling the next meeting in early February and that hopefully a preliminary model would be available from Intera at that time. Mr. Williams stated that the regional planning meeting should be in early February as well but that the date was not yet set. Mr. Walthour stated that he believed that it is helpful to coordinate with the PWPG and have the meetings close together. Mr. Williams stated that having meetings on consecutive days like this session is better for travel arrangements. Chairman Zimmer asked if it would be possible to push the meeting towards the third week of February. Members held a discussion about dates. Chairman Zimmer set meeting on February 18 at 10:00 am in the PRPC Board Room.

17. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Haley moved to adjourn second by Mr. Tate. Chairman Zimmer declared the meeting adjourned at approximately 12:21 pm.