

# Groundwater Management Area #1 Meeting

## Minutes

February 25, 2016

The Groundwater Management Area Number 1 (GMA #1) met on Thursday, February 25, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in the PRPC Board Room, 415 SW 8<sup>th</sup> 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: Amy Bush, Kent Satterwhite, Robert Bradley, Scott Honeyfield, Bill Mullican, Danny Krienke, Gene Born, Josh Winegarner, Dale Hallmark, Keith Good, Mike Beauchamp

### 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 July 23, 2015 GMA #1 Meeting.

Mr. Haley pointed out that on agenda item #8, the word “over” needed to be inserted into the third line for better comprehension. Mr. Walthour stated that Mr. Krienke’s name was misspelled in several places. A motion was made by Mr. Tate to adopt the minutes with the specified corrections. Motion was seconded by Mr. Hardcastle and carried 4-0.

6. **Discuss and Consider** - Action as may be necessary in regard GMA #1 Officers and Membership.

Mr. Ingham stated that this agenda items is an annually occurring item as each of the officers of GMA #1, being the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary, need to be re-selected as per the bylaws each year. He continued that each officer can serve for a maximum of four years. Mr. Ingham stated that at present, all current officers are eligible to serve for another one-year term limit if the group so chooses. Mr. Ingham reviewed when each officer took their position and demonstrated that none had met their four year limit and was eligible for reappointment. Mr. Hardcastle asked if everyone was agreeable to continue serving on the GMA#1 and received affirmation from the group. Mr. Hardcastle made a motion to reappoint the current slate of officers. Mr. Tate seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

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

Mr. Ingham stated that the 82<sup>nd</sup> Texas Legislature passed Bill 660 that requires a member or designee of a GMA be assigned to the regional water planning groups. He continued that at this time the Panhandle Water Planning Group (PWPG) currently has two GMA representatives one from GMA#1 and one from GMA#8. Mr. Ingham stated that this agenda item allows GMA#1 to appoint a representative to the PWPG. He continued that for the past three years this position has been held by Mr. Krienke. Mr. Ingham gave Mr. Krienke's qualifications and stated that Mr. Krienke can continue in this position or if the group chooses, a new representative can be appointed. Mr. Tate motioned to reappoint Mr. Krienke as GMA#1 representative to the PWPG. Mr. Haley seconded the motion to continue with Mr. Krienke as the GMA#1 representative. Motion carried 4-0.

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 beginning in 2007, when GMA#1 started meeting, there was not an administrative agent to assist in the planning process. He continued that PRPC has been involved in regional water planning issues since 1997 as the political subdivision for the PWPG. Mr. Ingham continued that PRPC was requested by GMA#1 to serve in the administrative capacity for GMA#1 as well. Mr. Ingham detailed the administrative scope of services for GMA#1 and reviewed administrative fees associated with the administrative contract. Mr. Ingham discussed how the administrative costs are charged, being evenly split among the four GCD's. Mr. Hardcastle asked if Mr. Ingham had a figure for total costs for administration in the previous year and if the districts are billed directly. Mr. Ingham stated Mr. Hardcastle was correct and the districts are billed directly. He continued that he did not have the exact figure for costs, but estimated costs to be less than \$5,000. Mr. Haley asked Mr. Ingham, if the PRPC wanted to continue in the administrative capacity for the group. Mr. Ingham stated that PRPC recognized the importance of the water planning process to the region and believed PRPC's ability to provide a neutral place and staff for the planning process as a very important aspect. He continued that PRPC works to maintain administrative services for the group at minimal costs and would like to continue serving in the administrative capacity. Mr. Haley motioned to keep the current contract in place with PRPC. Mr. Hardcastle second. Motion carried 4-0.

9. **Discuss and Consider** - Each District Representative in GMA 1 to present draft proposed statements of Desired Future Conditions for all relevant aquifers within each District for the purposes of subsequent considerations required by Texas Water Code Section 36.108 (d) (1-9).

Mr. Walthour stated that this agenda item allows an opportunity for GCD's to make a presentation and give a range so that numbers and information can be collected for the purpose of providing Intera information to run modeling. Mr. Walthour stated that in the North Plains GCD, for Dallam, Hartley, Moore and Sherman Counties they would like to continue with the 40% storage left in 50 years for the Ogallala, combining with the Rita Blanca Aquifer. He continued that they will continue with 40% storage left in 50 years for the Dockum Aquifer. Mr. Walthour further stated that the North Plains GCD also want to continue with 50% storage left in 50 years for Hansford, Hutchinson, Ochiltree and Lipscomb Counties and that the 50 years for all of the above references runs from 2020 to 2070.

Mr. Hardcastle stated that Panhandle GCD has had a 50/50 goal in place since 1998. He continued that all of the current policies and rules in place have worked towards this 50/50 goal and at this time they choose to stay with the same 50/50 goal.

Mr. Haley stated that currently Hemphill County has a unique set of circumstance to consider and they currently believe that there is a good amount of groundwater in storage with an estimate of 15 million/acre feet. Mr. Haley continued that there is more natural discharge of the groundwater than production in the Hemphill UWCD. Mr. Haley discussed the current state of the aquifer in Hemphill County and the fact that they do not believe that it is steadily declining, as natural discharge outpaced production even during the drought of record. He further stated that the predictive GAM run by Intera shows 58 thousand/acre feet of availability per year over 50 years which would cover all current and projected demands in the County. Mr. Haley continued that while Hemphill County utilizes the same Ogallala Aquifer as the other counties in GMA#1, the joint planning process demonstrates that the aquifer uses and conditions varies significantly from one area to another. Mr. Haley stated that Hemphill UWCD proposes the same DFC of 80% of the current volume in storage over a 50 year period.

Mr. Coleman referred to a memo, from Bill Hutchinson who is engage with GMA#2, which will be included in the official minutes. Mr. Coleman continued, stating that the memo is a summary of work that has been performed for that group. He further stated that the GMA#2 had a meeting on January 6<sup>th</sup> with two more meetings to follow on March 10<sup>th</sup> and April 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Coleman continued that the High Plains Aquifer System GAM model was updated and several districts provided funds to assist with this update. He further stated that the information shown in the memo is from this H.P.A.S. model and the goal was to demonstrate the effects of several different pumping scenarios to determine if one of these scenarios was appropriate for a proposed DFC statement. Mr. Coleman continued that the memo details fifteen different scenarios, examining both different pumping amounts and saturated thicknesses. Mr. Coleman referenced several charts included in the memo, explaining how the charts were created and the pumping representation applied. He specifically discussed the chart demonstrating modeled available groundwater based on each of the different pumping scenarios. Mr. Coleman clarified that the model is showing all of Armstrong County and was only for the Ogallala Aquifer even though other aquifers are present in the District. He continued that Mr. Hutchinson followed up this memo with the Board and reviewed this representative information along with tasks to round out the consideration and describe the differences in the current model compared to the previous model. Mr. Coleman stated that other

districts in GMA#2 agreed that this was a good overview of several different scenarios and the data set is likely to be considered as a quantitative statement for the proposed DFC in April.

Mr. Tate followed up Mr. Coleman's discussion by referred to the chart of saturated thickness for Randall County in the memo. He stated that this was a good example demonstrating that, in general, there is 60 to 70% of volume in storage remaining when you get to 2060 and 2070. There were some discussion among the group about how to read the presented charts and how the current MAG was presented. Mr. Coleman clarified that the black line is always the DFC related to the data set and that the MAG is based on the old model.

Mr. Walthour asked if Mr. Coleman was proposing a draw down. Mr. Coleman stated that he couldn't answer at this time, but anticipated that in the GMA#2 meeting in March these discussions would take place. Mr. Walthour stated that there is an existing DFC and related MAGs for the High Plains UWCD and if there is a range of difference between this and the current information based on the memo. Mr. Tate stated that quantified as a percentage, what is remaining would be greater for these three counties than under the old DFC. Chairman Zimmer clarified that they were hoping to get some percentages or ranges to be able to provide Intera information to run some models. Mr. Tate stated that the High Plains Board wanted more time before giving any percentages or ranges relating to a proposed DFC. Chairman Zimmer asked the two districts containing the City of Amarillo, if population prediction to 2060 were realistic as far as growth for City and as a need for water. Mr. Tate stated that the proposed question would have a greater effect on the Panhandle GCD than High Plains. Mr. Williams stated that he doesn't anticipate much change in Randall County. He continued that it is already considered in Roberts County, but doesn't see it as a driving factor in either place.

Mr. Walthour stated that DFC's, in past rounds, have been developed largely along county lines. He continued that there are two options in looking at the presented memo by High Plains: either you can divide it for all of Randall or Potter County or you can split it among the parts contained within each district. Mr. Walthour continue by asking what should be done with Oldham County as it is not included in a district, but will still need a DFC for modeling purposes. Mr. Williams agreed that it is a good question as to how to account for areas that are not included in a district. There was some discussion among the group on how these areas were accounted for in previous modeling. Mr. Walthour stated that GMA#1 is going to have to decide what to do and how to account for those areas. Mr. Coleman stated that the direction in GMA#2 is to have one statement that applies to the entire area which includes High Plains and six other GCD's. He continued that getting consensus about the statement for the aquifer will affect the way that it is worded for all of the High Plains UWCD which encompasses a small part of Potter and Armstrong Counties. Mr. Walthour asked if there are any areas in Randall County that is not in a district. Mr. Tate confirmed that was correct; there are areas in Randall County that are not in High Plains UWCD or Panhandle GCD.

Chairman Zimmer clarified his question on the needs of Amarillo and asked if Mr. Satterwhite wanted to speak to why water needs may go up in the City of Amarillo. Mr. Satterwhite stated that there are projections for the City of Amarillo's needs but that he could not remember them off the top of his head. However, he continued, he believed a pessimistic projection is 1 to 2 percent growth due to water conservation. Mr. Krienke asked if the stated 1 to 2 percent was water usage growth or population growth. Mr. Satterwhite confirmed that it was population growth. There were more discussions

among the group on the growth of Amarillo how this has been considered by Panhandle Water Planning Group. Ms. Guthrie stated that in looking at the past predictive GAM run, numbers for Oldham County did not appear to be available. She asked Mr. Walthour if those numbers were available. Mr. Walthour stated that the numbers were available from Intera. There were discussions among the group about Oldham County and other areas that are not within a GCD.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Coleman if he believed that the High Plains Board would have an answer on what their proposed numbers would be by the next meeting. Mr. Williams continued that his concern was that if numbers were not available until April, then the Panhandle GCD would not have time to assess the impact on their DFC. Mr. Coleman stated that he thought they would have it by the March meeting. Mr. Williams followed up, stated that the presented graphs in the memo are showing a substantially more conservative look than what the current High Plains DFC's are set at. Mr. Tate agreed, stating that do to this fact, he did not believe anything done with the High Plains DFC would impact Panhandle GCD. Mr. Williams and Mr. Tate discussed the effect of the High Plains on the surrounding areas particularly those that are not in a GCD. Mr. Coleman stated that his understanding of the H.P.A.S. model is to try and draw down the aquifer to 50%. He continued that more pumping was assigned to try to pump enough water to meet this condition than was actually used in some instances. Mr. Walthour asked if it appeared that the current DFC is more liberal than what they will potentially be setting. Mr. Tate confirmed that it would be more liberal or very similar.

Mr. Walthour confirmed that the Panhandle GCD does not include any part of Randall County. He asked, preliminarily, if the Panhandle GCD would want to apply whatever High Plains sets the DFC at for Randall County to their district. Mr. Williams stated that at this early stage, they most likely would, if for no other reason than simplicity. He continued that it would need to be reviewed by the Board. Ms. Guthrie asked if the High Plains statements will be done county-by-county. Mr. Coleman stated that it would not be and the goal is to have one statement for all of GMA#2 which includes the High Plains UWCD. Mr. Williams stated that things are getting confusing for the general public, as far as, knowing who to go to for permits and/or the DFC. He further stated they are supposed to do what is best for the public and/or for expediency of the process, but it is very confusing for the general public in having different rules and DFCs within the same county. Mr. Williams continued that it may be better to swap parts of the districts to better coincide with county lines. He stated that the Panhandle GCD has tried to reconcile some of the boundaries within the appraisal district due to concern of properties that could potentially be getting double taxed in Potter County. Mr. Tate stated that it could potentially be a very difficult issue politically to alter the boundaries for a GCD's.

Mr. Walthour asked if the High Plains DFC statement will be presented as a range for the draw down, since it will not be a percentage. Mr. Coleman stated, that as far as discussions that have taken place to-date, it will be presented as a solid number. Chairman Zimmer asked Mr. Walthour what the timeline is to be able to get information to Intera and produce a model. Mr. Walthour stated it is three to four weeks. The group agreed that this presented a very tight timeline on producing the required proposed DFC's. Mr. Walthour asked what was anticipated to come out of the March GMA#2 meeting. Mr. Coleman stated that he anticipates the wording and description of the statement as well as an update to the Dockum Aquifer. Mr. Walthour confirmed that in March, GMA#1 should have a pretty good idea on what the High Plains proposed DFC may be. Mr. Coleman agreed. Mr. Hardcastle reiterated that the Panhandle GCD's concern is how the High Plains DFC will affect their numbers and the proposed 50/50

future condition. Mr. Williams asked if there were any numbers that would allow GMA#1 to be able to move forward on the model now. Mr. Walthour agreed with Mr. Williams stating that they need to be able to move forward with the model so that each GCD can develop and propose a DFC. Ms. Guthrie wanted to confirm that Oldham County would be contingent on Potter County. The group agreed that Oldham County wouldn't change, leaving it at a 50/50. Mr. Williams reiterated that two different DFC in the same county exacerbates the problem for the public. Mr. Williams asked if the High Plains UWCD had any issues with continuing with what was in place last time to be able to run the model. Mr. Walthour stated that a potential end result of utilizing what was in place last time is that the updated model should demonstrate the low end on what would be in the upper surrounding counties. He continued that should the High Plains UWCD adopt a more conservative DFC, then more water should be available. Chairman Zimmer asked if it would be beneficial for High Plains to run the GAM at 50/50 for the entire counties. Mr. Tate stated that they didn't have any objection and he did not believe it would make a difference as the areas are so small. Mr. Hardcastle stated that it depends on how the differences are quantified, but agreed that as far as impacts hydrologically, there isn't a big issue.

Chairman Zimmer asked if the group agreed, in concept, that a 50/50 could be used for Oldham County for a GAM run. The group agreed. Chairman Zimmer asked if the group agreed that the managers work together on Potter, Randall and Armstrong by the March meeting as to not be in a bind moving towards the April meeting. The group agreed. Mr. Hardcastle asked about remaining parts of Hutchinson, Moore and Hartley County. Mr. Walthour stated that this was answered the last time this was done and is covered in the statement. There was some group discussion about these portions of the counties and what they will be set at for the new GAM run. Ms. Guthrie confirmed that there would be another GAM run and if the approaches needed to be changed. Mr. Walthour confirmed that the North Plains GCD would be changing some of its answer especially in regards to production since 2011. He continued that other managers need to look at their starting points and stated that this is an opportunity to look at the MAG. Mr. Ingham asked if Intera could start running the GAM excluding the portions of the Potter, Randall, and Armstrong Counties still in doubt. Mr. Walthour stated that he did not believe that is an option and all data needed to be available to run the model. He continued that in order to start running the model they can leave the 50/50 for those areas until the districts decide what they want to do.

Chairman Zimmer called for a five minute recess at 11:27.

10. **Receive, Discuss, and Consider** – Groundwater Availability Model Task Run 15-006 produced by the Texas Water Development Board related to total estimated recoverable storage under Texas Administrative Code Rule 356.10.

Chairman Zimmer called the meeting back to order at 11:35. Mr. Walthour stated that this is a modeled run after the update on H.P.A.S. for models on total recoverable storage for aquifers in GMA#1. He continued that the numbers have been updated and stated that he did not believe there was a significant change in the overall numbers. Mr. Walthour discussed what TERS (Total Estimated Recoverable Storage) means and how it is applicable to DFCs and MAG numbers. He continued, stating that TERS basically means all of the water in storage that you can ever get out of an aquifer. Mr. Walthour continued that if a DFC is proposed that exceeds the TERS numbers then there is a problem. Mr. Williams stated that he wanted to utilize this data to make a point relating to the Blaine Aquifer for a future agenda item. He continued that in reviewing page 19,

there are only 500 acre feet of recoverable storage for the Seymour Aquifer in Donley County, according to the chart. These charts will be included in the official minutes.

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

- a. Information regarding Aquifer Uses or Conditions within the management area, including conditions that differ substantially from one geographic area to another for each of the Major Aquifers in GMA#1. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(1)}

Mr. Walthour stated that PRPC Staff has been working towards making items relating to GAM#1 available via Dropbox for the public. Mr. Walthour continued that this is a work in progress, however some of the factors in addition to the GAM run need to be filled in between now and the submission date. Mr. Walthour reviewed the submission documents starting with the 9 Factors. He reviewed each of the items in the corresponding factor including the GMA#1 Exempt Use document and the Major Aquifer Uses 2004-2013. This report has been handed out and is part of the official minutes. Mr. Walthour reviewed this report explaining many of the charts and figures and how they were computed. Mr. Walthour asked that the group review this report prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Walthour continued his review of the documents in the 9 Factors explaining the Minor Aquifers report which was provided based on the TWDB's historical information. Mr. Walthour stated that before the next meeting he will have reviewed the H.P.A.S. model which provides some of new numbers based on the modeling effort. Mr. Walthour reviewed documents relating to Water Needs and Uses. He continued, stating that most of these items have been reviewed by the regional water plan. Mr. Walthour continued going through each of the folders and documents available on Dropbox. Mr. Walthour stated that by the next meeting they will look at the Environmental Factors relating to the H.P.A.S. model. In reviewing the folder of Subsidence, Mr. Walthour stated that based on management plans there is no problem with subsidence for GMA#1. Mr. Walthour reviewed submission documents and reports concerning the Socio-Economic Impact Reports. Mr. Walthour continued with the Private Property Rights information stating that Mr. Keith Good's presentation on private property rights is the only report included here at this time. He continued that if anybody wanted to add anything else with regards to any of these issues, the March meeting would be the appropriate time to do so.

Mr. Walthour stated that under Feasibility of Achieving the DFC, the documents cannot be filled out until there are some MAG's available to determine this information. Mr. Walthour stated that based on early discussions, it doesn't appear there will be an issue with Feasibility of Achieving the DFC. However, Mr. Walthour continued, there may be some border issues. In regards to Other Relevant Factors, Mr. Walthour stated there are currently not any listed, but if anybody feels like there should be, they can be added. Mr. Walthour stated that under Meetings, all historical data is included such as: sign in sheets, minutes, and agenda packets. He continued that this information is available and can be used to assist in setting the proposed DFC. Mr. Walthour continued his review, stating that the Models folder is currently empty because the H.P.A.S. model was such a large file, but will have the model information available. Mr. Walthour quickly reviewed the Non-Relevant Folder as a place holder for information relating to items declared non-relevant. Mr. Walthour asked for Mr. Williams's expertise and assistance in preparing the documents necessary for non-relevant submittals. Mr. Walthour discussed the Summary Section, stating that what is currently available is a very rough draft and since this

process is unfinished, it is still under development. Mr. Walthour stated that the information received from High Plains UWCD today will be available under the Uses Folder. He asked the group to review the uploaded minutes and if something is missing as far as presentations, charts or necessary information, to provide it so it can be included. Mr. Walthour stated that when the proposed DFC's are complete and published, all of this information will be available to the public to be viewed and downloaded.

Ms. Guthrie asked if everything had been introduced and discussed with regards to the 9 Factors. Mr. Walthour stated that if a proposed DFC is being considered that is different than previous discussions, each of these factors will need to be revisited again. He continued that a final consideration will need to be made after the March meeting and the proposed DFC's become a little clearer. Mr. Hardcastle stated that he does not have access to Dropbox. Mr. Walthour stated that he would make sure that everyone in the group has access to Dropbox. He also stated that the information available on Dropbox is very large, but could potentially be made in another manner such as a CD or thumb drive. Mr. Walthour said these are not final documents and that there will be more information added as the process continues.

- b. Information regarding water supply needs and water management strategies included in the 2012 Texas State Water Plan. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(2)}

No comments received under this item.

- c. Information regarding background information related to hydrologic conditions, including for each aquifer in the GMA#1 planning area, the *current* total estimated recoverable storage as provided by the Texas Water Development Board Executive Administrator. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(3)}

No comments received under this item.

- d. Information regarding Environmental Impacts, including impacts on spring flow and other interactions between groundwater and surface water of potential Desired Future Conditions in the major aquifers of GMA#1. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(4)}

No comments received under this item.

- e. Information regarding the impact of subsidence of potential Desired Future Conditions in the major aquifers of GMA#1. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(5)}

No comments received under this item.

- f. Information regarding the socioeconomic impacts reasonably expected to occur based on potential Desired Future Conditions in the major aquifers of GMA#1. {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(6)}

No comments received under this item.

- g. Information 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)}

No comments received under this item.

- h. Information regarding the feasibility of achieving the Desired Future Condition {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(8)}

No comments received under this item.

- i. Information regarding any other information relevant to Desired Future Conditions {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(9)}

No comments received under this item.

**12. Discuss and Consider** – Consideration of Seymour Aquifer to be non-relevant to the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area.

Mr. Hardcastle stated the memo for this agenda item was incorrect, stating that the memo lists Hall County and it should be Donley County. Mr. Hardcastle stated that considering Mr. Williams previous observation on agenda item #10 and considering the usage and the amount of acreage of the Seymour Aquifer within Donley County it should be declared non-relevant. Mr. Hardcastle moved that the Seymour Aquifer located in Donley County, due to minimal availability, is declared non-relevant to the GMA#1 for planning purposes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tate and carried 4-0.

**13. Receive and Discuss** - GMA#1 District Representatives are currently considering Desired Future Condition options for relevant aquifers within the GMA#1 Joint Planning area, as required by Texas Water Code Section 36.108. The GMA#1 Membership may receive technical presentations from entities/individuals within GMA#1 who desire to propose possible alternative Desired Future Condition options from those being discussed in the joint planning-process. Time permitting, all entities/individuals appearing before GMA#1 for this agenda item may be afforded up to fifteen (15) minutes to make technical presentations on alternative Desired Future Condition Options. All proposed alternative Desired Future Condition options presented will be considered by GMA#1 Members and the results of those considerations documented in the GMA#1 Explanatory Report as required by Texas Water Code Section 36.108.

Chairman Zimmer opened this agenda item for anybody who wished to speak to this item. No one came forward by the Board or public. Mr. Walthour clarified that the agenda item was purposefully written in such a way that it is exceedingly clear as to what it is meant for.

**14. Receive, Discuss, and Consider** – Draft Summary Document related to the GMA#1 Explanatory Report.

Mr. Walthour stated that the document given to the board is a very rough draft of the Summary Document that will be released to the public once the proposed DFC's are set. He continued that once this document is released and posted, it will start the 90 day public comment period. Mr. Walthour further clarified that this document is not the explanatory report, but is the document that goes out for public consumption to review what the group has gone through with regards to the Factors and other issues once the DFC has been set. He continued that the draft Summary Document can be changed and adjusted as needed by the group. Mr. Coleman asked if this document is a word document. Mr. Walthour stated that it can be sent out as a word document and could be

changed by the managers as needed. Ms. Guthrie asked several questions relating to the draft Summary Document. She stated that she did not understand the sentence “the lower end of this estimate is highly unlikely to be obtainable in GMA#1” in the Hydrological Conditions Section. Mr. Walthour stated that it looks like the statement was worded wrong and that it needed to be corrected. Mr. Walthour further stated that a separate summary may need to be done with regards to this Section. Ms. Guthrie pointed out another correction with the report in regards to the Ogallala Aquifer. She stated that the separation between the Northern Ogallala and the Southern Ogallala says Canadian River and is incorrect. Mr. Walthour agreed that a correction needs to be made. Ms. Guthrie also referenced page 12, stating that she did not find what report was being referred to. Mr. Ingham stated that this was the meeting in which stream flow was discussed and that Ms. Guthrie provided a report in regards to that subject. Ms. Guthrie also pointed to page 5, Factor 7 and asked if the Districts needed to provide their interpretations of private property rights. Mr. Walthour stated that Mr. Good’s presentation is already included and that is the only thing that the four members can consider. He continued that if there is something else that needs to be considered then it needed to be brought forward. Mr. Walthour also stated that this is to allow for the group to bring forward other items. He continued that the managers needed to look this document over, as it is a working document and needs further refinement. Mr. Walthour reiterated that this document is to offer to the public information regarding this process. He continued that there are no guidelines for the Summary Document. Mr. Hardcastle clarified that this Summary Document is collecting information so that once a DFC has been proposed, it along with other information, can be sent to the individual districts for examination. Mr. Walthour confirmed. Mr. Williams followed up, asking that after the individual districts have public hearings and receive comments, those comments will be forward back to Mr. Ingham and PRPC. Mr. Walthour stated that that would be addressed at a later time as the process continues.

**15. Discuss and Consider – Hearing Process for the Consideration of Desired Future Conditions in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area.**

Mr. Walthour reviewed Code 36 to clarify requirements and timelines associated with proposing and adopting a DFC. Mr. Walthour continued that the joint planning committee is required only to propose a DFC by May 1<sup>st</sup> and believes that this is an appropriate deadline. Mr. Walthour referred to Section B-5 and read the Code to the group stating that nothing is required before May 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Walthour stated that in order to get to this step, the group must proposed a DFC in order to conduct a MAG run and consider if the proposal fits the conditions. He continued that the next step will be to start the period for public comments and this is done after the public receives the Summary. Mr. Walthour continued that at the end of the process and within the 90 days, each district should hold a separate hearing and report back to the GMA#1 on its findings. Mr. Walthour continued describing the proposal process for adoption. Mr. Walthour recommended that a meeting is needed in March to clean up everything that needs to go out to the public, for the committee to considered any potential changes and possibly to consider preliminary proposals in order for adoptions to be done in May.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Good if the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for proposals is a hard deadline. The group agreed that May 1<sup>st</sup> was a hard deadline, but the deadline to adopt is a grey area. There was discussion among the group about deadlines and when things must be complete. Mr. Mullican stated that the group needs to consider that at the end of the 90 days, each district is required to compile a summary of comments received and make appropriate revisions to the proposed DFC’s. He continued that the summary report should summarize the comments and each individual district will want to review the

report. Mr. Walthour stated that the earliest this can be done is 45 days after the 90 day comment period. There were discussions among the group regarding the hearing process and when everything is required to take place. Chairman Zimmer stated that the job at this level is to set a DFC and the districts boards' job is to have the public comment period locally. He continued that this is important so that the public can see that GMA#1 took time to review all public comments. Chairman Zimmer continued that the group had the right to review all public comments and recommended the group to pick two dates with April being the target date.

16. **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.

Chairman Zimmer stated that the North Plain GCD updated rules last April and that these rule adjustments were mostly minor modifications in order to bring them into compliance. Mr. Zimmer gave a few details regarding these rule adjustments including rules related to wells and allowing for 10 wells per section. He continued that a small well classification was also allowed that were not previously exempt.

Mr. Haley stated that Hemphill County UWCD was working on rules to incorporate statutory changes.

Mr. Hardcastle and Mr. Tate had no rules changes to report to the group.

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

The group discussed the scheduling of the next GMA and considered possible dates. Mr. Walthour proposed March 17<sup>th</sup> for the next GMA meeting at 10:00 a.m. and the group agreed. Discussion for scheduling an April meeting ensued. Mr. Mullican stated that there is a 10 day posting requirement for May 1<sup>st</sup> and that this doesn't leave very much if any time if something potentially goes wrong. April 20<sup>th</sup> was agreed upon by the group for a GMA#1 meeting.

18. **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Haley and seconded by Mr. Tate. The motion passed with unanimous assent by a 4-0 vote. Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.