



Groundwater Management Area #1 – GMA#1

P.O. Box 9257 Amarillo, TX 79105 (806) 372-3381

PRPC REPORT ON

Manager's Meeting
3:00 PM – December 11, 2013
Panhandle Regional Planning Commission
Conference Room A
415 W. 8th
Amarillo, Texas 79105

Access also available at: 877-841-9268 Code: 645324

THIS IS NOT A FORMAL MEETING OF THE GMA#1 VOTING MEMBERSHIP OR ANY SUBCOMMITTEE COMPRISED OF GMA#1 VOTING MEMBERSHIP

GMA#1 Chairman, John R. Spearman, has requested that the Managers of each of the four Groundwater Conservation Districts in GMA#1 meet on December 11, 2013 to discuss the following topics in preparation for the next full meeting of Groundwater Management Area #1.

The discussion session began at 3:05 with C.E. Williams (PGCD), Steve Walthour (NPGCD), and Janet Guthrie (HCUWCD) present and Jason Coleman (HPWD) calling in on a phone line. Kyle Ingham, Jamie Allen, and Joe Price from PRPC were in attendance with Kyle Ingham facilitating the meeting.

1. Strategies for GMA#1 to meet timelines associated with adopting DFC's.

To begin the meeting the four Districts reviewed information that was associated with the November 11, 2009 Petition Hearing to identify work that had been done in a prior cycle to see if any of the information or even presentation format could be useful. It was determined that some of the information could be used as a starting point for this cycle and some of the way it was presented could be a base also. However, all parties present agreed that in this cycle it is important to work together to develop the DFC and the responses to all of the legislatively required criteria as opposed to each District bringing their responses and compiling them.

The group had an extensive discussion regarding the Districts' plans to garner input from their local constituencies prior to discussing a Proposed DFC in the full GMA#1. Each District has a different plan for ensuring that they have a strong understanding of what the people within the District want to see in the DFC. This process, though different from District to District, was discussed as a Pre-Planning Phase. The general feeling was that by going through a pre-planning

phase locally before a Proposed DFC is put on the table there will be a stronger likelihood that the DFC process will incorporate public input.

It was agreed that the timeline that Bill Mullican presented at the previous GMA#1 meeting would be a very good starting point in forward planning. However, each District has a different timeline on their pre-planning activities that may overlap with some of the chronology in the Mullican timeline.

The final timing piece that was discussed was how the timing of the adoption of a Proposed DFC differs from the previous cycle. In the previous cycle no DFC was adopted, including a proposed, until the very end of the cycle. In this cycle, the Proposed DFC does need to be adopted early so that the GMA can address each of the 9 items fully in relationship to the Proposed DFC.

2. GMA#1's current capacity to address all nine legislatively required considerations associated with the adoption of a DFC.

The Nine Legislatively required considerations are:

1. Aquifer uses and conditions within the management area, including conditions that differ substantially from one geographic area to another
 - a. The Districts all have different information available on
 - i. Well locations
 - ii. Geological stratus modeling of the aquifer
 - iii. Surface Usage
 - b. The challenge will be to incorporate different available information into a uniform manner
 - c. Extensive focus was given this matter in the previous petition process
 - d. It may take a technical expert to compile some of the GIS and mapping data needed from the 4 Districts on this topic
2. Water supply needs and water management strategies included in the state water plan
 - a. This item should be pretty straight forward as our groundwater issues and the regional water plan have been pretty well in alignment for a while.
 - b. It will be key in these discussions to differentiate between total water and estimated recoverable (that with infrastructure to access). These are two different things.
 - c. It is expected that the only counties showing deficiencies may be in the North Plains District. If that is the case, this is an item where one District may want to focus on it more than others.
3. Hydrological conditions, including for each aquifer in the GMA the total estimated recoverable storage as provided by the Texas Water Development Board Executive Administrator, and the average annual recharge, inflows, and discharge
 - a. This item and the previous item were discussed at the same time.
 - i. It will be key in these discussions to differentiate between total water and estimated recoverable (that with infrastructure to access). These are two different things.
 - b. This is an item where a technical consultant for the group may be highly appropriate.

- c. Information on recharge, inflows, and discharge is readily available from previous work, but a technical compilation may be necessary
- 4. Environmental Impacts, including impacts on spring flow and other interactions between groundwater and surface water
 - a. This is an item where the Districts have not done a lot of research to date given the minimal interaction in the region.
 - b. A reference to some of CRMWA's work was made since this may be the best available information in the region to date.
 - c. Technical research and/or compilation may be appropriate on this item
- 5. The Impact of subsidence
 - a. Not Applicable in GMA#1
- 6. Socioeconomic impacts reasonably expected to occur
 - a. There is a wealth of data available related to this topic from the Districts and Texas Agrilife. The challenge will be identifying all of the available data, reviewing the data, and putting it into a uniform presentation.
- 7. Impact on the interests and rights in private property, including ownership and the rights of management area landowners and their leasees and assigns in groundwater as recognized in Texas Water Code 36.002
 - a. There is still a discrepancy among the parties at the meeting relating to this topic. One view is that this is a legal issue where attorneys input and information would likely be necessary. The other view is that this is more of a technical issue on how much water is actually available for a specific proposed DFC.
 - b. This is an issue that will need further discussion in future meetings.
- 8. The feasibility of achieving the DFC
 - a. This topic should be pretty straight forward as each District did this analysis in the previous cycle. Depending on the DFC the Districts will all need to assess their existing rules, potential rules, and data from previous items in this analysis to establish feasibility.
- 9. Any other information relevant to the specific DFC
 - a. None identified at this time

It was discussed as to what PRPC could do in relationship to each of these items. PRPC is quite capable of organizing data and presenting it in a uniform manner. Kyle even suggested a process by which each of the areas of focus is addressed at GMA meetings with slide show presentations that become part of the meeting record to document how each topic was addressed along with discussion. However, in relationship to some of the more technical items 3, 4, & 7 specifically it is probably advisable to have experts involved in the process. Other items may also need technical assistance. The group discussed that if any consultants are hired by the GMA#1 they could potentially operate under the management of PRPC. PRPC is agreeable to this arrangement, but identifying procurement for professional services is still something that needs to be discussed.

The current DFC was discussed as a starting point for considering proposed DFCs going forward. With a few exceptions, the group viewed this as reasonable starting place. The concept of using some more simple method of establishing a DFC other than % of available over time was introduced. The group determined that there may well be other viable options for the GMA#1 voting membership to discuss.

3. Potential benefits and challenges of contracting a technical consultant for DFC adoption process.
 - a. It highly recommended that on some of the technical items that a consultant be involved. The three options on this topic are as follows.
 - i. Each district use their own technical consultants and bring their information to the table. The challenge here is that this would make joint planning more difficult.
 - ii. A second option would be to hire a technical consultant for GMA#1. The concern here is potential costs and possible time issues with procurement depending on whose procurement policies are used
 - iii. A third option would be for the GMA#1 to agree on using one District's technical consultant for the primary development of technical items. Consensus on this may be a challenge and then cost concerns as to who is paying for what could arise.
 - b. C.E. Williams agreed to talk with Bill Mullican about what he is doing in other GMAs and how he would envision working with GMA#1. The group agreed that this would be very useful information to have. Further, there is the potential for discussion between Bill and Kyle Ingham. Please note that none of these discussions imply any standing agreement or even the consideration of procurement in the future for services.
4. Potential benefits and challenges of contracting legal counsel for DFC adoption process.
 - a. The Districts were not in agreement on whether legal counsel would be needed or not.
 - b. If legal counsel is needed, then the discussions associated with item 3 are all applicable.
5. Procurement requirements associated with professional services that might be enlisted by GMA#1.
 - a. If any professional services exceeding \$10,000 are procured by PRPC under the existing PRPC/GMA#1 Interlocal Agreement PRPC's guidelines must be followed. These guidelines require a Request for Qualifications for services, a scoring of the Statements of Qualifications submitted, and a review of qualifications without consideration of cost. Vendors would then be ranked based on qualifications and negotiations with the top vendor could begin.
 - b. Other procurement options were discussed from the perspective of a District doing the procurement or even the GMA#1 itself doing the procurement.
 - c. It was discussed that it is a good idea to touch base with other GMA's to determine how they have procured professional services.

This was a very open and direct meeting, and the discussions were very productive. All of the parties present did not agree fully on all topics, but it was apparent that there was great desire to work together in true joint planning. These notes are not meeting minutes, transcriptions of the meeting, or public documents of any type. Their sole purpose is to document for the people present at the meeting a basic outline of the topics discussed.

This agenda is intended to guide discussion for GMA#1 General Managers and is not a formal meeting notice and as such is not subject to Open Meetings Posting Requirements.