

Groundwater Management Area #1 Meeting

Minutes

April 20, 2016

The Groundwater Management Area Number 1 (GMA #1) met on Wednesday, April 20, 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,

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 10:04 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 March 17, 2016 GMA #1 Meeting.

Mr. Hardcastle stated that on page 8, “mr. Walthour based on the data that many counties will meet the requirements.” All of the 2012 state water plan must be addressed. Mr. Williams, page 2 Blaine and Seymore irrelevant to nonrelevant for

planning purposes. Coleman page 2 Robert Bradley not Bill Mullican. Majority not majority. Hardcastle move as corrected Tate second.

6. **Discuss and Consider** – Present options for Proposed DFCS for major aquifers in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area under Texas Water Code Section 36.108 (d) (1-9) for:

- a. Ogallala Aquifer inclusive of the Rita Blanca Aquifer
- b. Dockum Aquifer

- Ingham need to introduce the proposed dfc by which the factors are measured. Requested to introduce the proposed dfc, which is included in one resolution that includes both aquifers. Chairman, this is not to vote for at this particular time. Ingham read this as presented for discussion amongst the group.
- Dallam hartly moore
- Hansford, lipscomb, Oldham and panhandle district in
- This is the proposal of the DFC as understood at the current time.

7. **Receive, Discuss, and Consider** – Any new developments, available data, or public comment related to the following items related to a proposed Desired Future Condition for the Ogallala Aquifer inclusive of the Rita Blanca Aquifer and the Dockum Aquifer in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area:

- 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)}

- Walthour if at the end anybody would like to add information. This is looking at the 4/6/16 model from Intera. In the information both the modeled available groundwater and percentage of draw down is available. The information and presentation is included in the official minutes. Walthour presented information relating to past models used, and prior GMA meetings. Walthour also demonstrated the targets of what each of the districts wanted for the 4/6 model. Mr. Walthour 4/6 predictive run was reviewed in a couple of different ways. Reviewed the total differences. Looking at 10 feet left in total saturated thickness. Dallam Hartley Sherman and moore counties show high agricultural usage and have an above average rate of decline. There is very limited stream flow. Next Walthour review the Ogallala dfcs for Armstrong, donley, carson, gray, Hansford, Hutchinson, lipscomb Ochiltree, Oldham, potter randall Roberts wheeler. Moderate ag usage, significant municipal well fields, average rate of decline. Then reviewed Hemphill County, min. ag usage, min. rate of decline, extensive stream flow, water related ecotourism, projective use is well below average mag.
- Walthour review Dockum DFC for Dallam Hartley, moore, Sherman showing that minim use compared to Ogallala,. Dockum for Armstrong, carson, Oldham potter, randall county – stating that current minimal use, confined and unconfined. Total water projects for PRWP. Stating that the counties in blue are the largest water projections for water use and are all over 10%. Demonstrated total projections for water use in 2016. Then showed historical and projected municipal water use, showing potter and randall as about 70% total municipal use in the entire area. Projections for water industrial water use in both 2011 and

2016 plan as well as agricultural use and irrigation use, live stock water use. Dallam Hansford Hartley Sherman are the largest live stock users. Compared all of the water uses between 2011 and 2016. Williams what are you trying to tell us. Walthour one of the things under factor 1 is projected water uses and this shows that. This is so that we can show that we have considered all of the water uses. Estimated exempt use by aquifer. Janet define exempt, Walthour chapter 36 exempt. Robert Bradley required to give chp 36 expemption as well as what was in the rules. But this does not include statuory exemptions included in the rules. Janet this would include Canadian. Bradley no that would not include that. Janet, it is in the rules, Bradley I will need to double check. Showed each of the GCD's exemption by aquifer.

- Ogallala aquifer pumping by use in GMA 1 2004-2013. Rita Blanca showing the same. Dockum showing the same. Blaine and Seymore shwing the same, very isolated, not much water coming from them.
- Factor 2, 2011 water plan, needs analysis compared to the mag. Diffence between demand and water in storage is the need. Only included areas showing a need. Walthour did an average mag of what would happen over a period of 50 years. Hartley does go about but on average it is still below. Hardcastle they are used in calculation of the average. Walthour yes that is correct. Williams water is coming out of carson to the city of Amarillo. Walthour that is correct. Taking care of that need is through irrigation conservation. Roberts, carson.....Amarillo has water rights in other counties that they are currently not producing. Walthour stated that for these purposes they went with what is in the regional plan. Walthour, MAG Run 5.3. checking mag predictive run against demand.
- Factor 3 and Factor 4 Hydrological conditions. Water budget for the Ogallala Aquifer by county for year 2012 fo the transient model. Wathour recharge in the HPAS model is pretty static and doesn't change much over time. Transient when you start pumping water things change. Springs, streams over the period is gaining water. Positive number means it is an inflow to the aquifer. Two things added that are not in a steady state model is resevoirs and wells. When you start pumping wells you start extracting water. This creates a storage number that you have to deal with unlike a steady state model which assumes storage is full. Wlathour gave description of cross formational flow. Highlighted hemphill because they provide more inflow that ultimately ends up in rivers than any other county. Very little water being pumped in hemphill and is almost 1 to 1 in storage.
- Water budget for Rita Blanca, combined aquifer, the only way to get water to it is cross formational flow. Water budget for the Dockum aquifer, this is the upper dockum and there is no recharge. All water that is pump from here is coming from storage or lateral flow or cross formational flow. But there is very little water being pumped. Cross formational flow it all leaves and goes to another aquifer.
- Water budget for lower dockum. There is a little recharge mostly in Oldham county.
- Factor 3 & 4 impacts – recharge should remain constant in the Ogallala aquifer if mag is fully produced. Lateral and cross formational flow will change inflow/outflow conditions. Reduction in storage should accelerate.

- Impacts for dockum recharge remain constant in lower, no recharge in upper. Discharges to springs rivers draws will continue to diminish. Reduction in storage.
 - Factor 5 impact on subsidence. There is no significant impact on subsidence. Have not seen any areas that this occurs.
 - Factor 6 will not have any socioeconomic impacts that – plan provides a good economic impact analysis.
 - Factor 7 impact on private property, more groundwater available than current and project pumping for both Agalla and Dockum.
 - Factor 8 – feasibility of achieving DFC. Dockham predictive GM are possible.
 - Factor 9 – any other information. – none
 - Chairman any other information to contribute. Tate Haley thank you Walhour.
- 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)}
 -
 - 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)}
 -
 - 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)}
 -
 - 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)}
 -
 - 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)}
 -
 - 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)}
 -
 - h. Information regarding the feasibility of achieving the Desired Future Condition {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(8)}

-
- i. Information regarding any other information relevant to Desired Future Conditions {Texas Water Code §36.108(d)(9)}
-
- 8. **Consider** – Proposed Desired Future Condition for the Ogallala Aquifer inclusive of the Rita Blanca Aquifer in the GMA#1 Joint Planning Area

-Chairman Zimmer stated that if the group would consider adopting a resolution for both agenda items 8 and 9. Mr. Ingham offered to read the resolution. Chair not necessary it has been read. Zimmer any thoughts or corrections to the resolution. No one offered any corrections. Coleman thank you for all your efforts Kyle and Steve. Monique, on the title technically were a proposing to adopt. Bradley if you adopt proposed dfc this is how other GMA's are doing it and you adopt final DFCs. Monique Resolution to adopt proposed dfcs. 2 changes to comply with statute. In the first whereas adopt "proposed" dfc. Ingham noted that the notices of the meeting are included in the packet of information by each of the members. Tate moved to adopt the proposed resolutions with the 2 revisions as pointed at by Monique. Hardcastle second. Motion carries 4-0

- 9. **Consider** – Proposed Desired Future Condition for the Dockum Aquifer in the GMA#1
-

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

- **Returned to the agenda item at the chair's discretion. Walthour 90 day process is a minimum. This does not start until all the documents are delivered to the GCDs. Kyle is going to get all the information together either on a drive or on a website and once that is received the time starts. Williams asked if the hearing required a 20 day notice. Monique the notice is a 10 day notice, but she has a drafted notice that meets the 36.108 requirements. Walthour confirmed that Monique would provide a template to use for the notice. Hardcastle, stated that you can go past the 90 day period but when is the hearing required. Walthour it is just required during the period but the 90 day period can be longer. The JPC can not consider for adoption until this process has taken place. Walthour stated that on page 9 of the draft explanation of the proposed dfcs it explains what is required. Coleman, gma 2 held their meeting early this week, Robert Bradley was also in attendance at this meeting. Stated that others are considering that members are considering holding the hearing in the middle of the 90 hearing so that public comments have to time to be received back from the public. Walthour north plains anticipates doing it this way. Zimmer any other questions. Walthour stated that if you take at least 90 days and the districts get the info about May 1, 90 days put you at August 1 so the districts would write a summary around Sept. the earliest that GMA would meet again is Sept. but there is no deadline. Coleman – 30 days to summarize feedback, 30 days to give each member to review. Which is consistent with Walthour's timeline. Zimmer, all gma's in Texas presenting their adopted dfcs in September. The timeline looks like it is pretty tight in order to make this happen on time. Bill Millican the Jan. 2017 goal is for chapter 16. Janet, the explanatory report is supposed to be ready by September. Walthour it will be ready after**

group has had time to complete and review the options. Monique meet after summaries are in, then meet to finalize the explanatory report. Walthour, working on a draft this summary. But it can not be completed until after the final adoption. Bill mullican 60 day rule after, you do final adoptions the explanatory report must be submitted. Williams how do you write the explanatory report if you do not know what the final dfc. Walthour you cant until everything is final. Williams if somebody brought forward a propose a change to the DFC what is the process. Mullican, depends on how big the change is. If it is a significant change it may need to have another 90 day public hearing process. Discussion among the group if all of the district had to go back through the process if one GCD changes their dfc. Williams it is difficult to go through these for the first time. Zimmer, explanatory report could take a few meetings to get it completed. Williams assumption is that if nothing is caught at the hearing then there may be no changes. Hardcastle what constitutes a formal challenge. Monique it would be after the gma to adopt the final dfc. There is a timeframe that some one would have to go to the individual district. Each individual district must approve these dfcs as well. Twdp is an expert witness but is not the judge. Hardcastle, there can be no challenge until the gma 1 or disctrict has approved the dfc. Monique that is correct. Monique gave some details on the challenge process. The challenge now is with one district and does not include all of the districts this time around.

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

- Jumped to this agenda item at chairs discretion ahead of item number 10. Walthour stated that this is included. Williams is this required by the TWDB. Bradley no, the explanatory report is not needed until final adoption. However this is good practice to have this information ready for the districts and hearings. Monique are other gmas also submitting these draft summary reports. Bradley, yes GMAs are doing this. Monique but are they being submitted to TWDB. Bradley, we do not need anything at this point until the final dfcs are adopted. We do not need the resolution for the proposed dfcs. Monique discussed this process with Larry French and he just wanted the proposed dfcs and does not need the draft summary document. Hardcastle and this serves as notice to the water development board that these steps have been complied with. Monique other GMAs have requested a percent error in the resolution for compatibility. Bradley we have not specifically for it, but may ask the consultants for the file. Mullican, this is only a matter of convenience and not anything official. Walthour, at this point he would suggest that if TWDB request a range then they can work on that. Chairman Zimmer, this draft explanation of proposed dfcs is what he wants to take this to the public. Walthour asked Ingham to discuss this explanation of the proposed dfcs. Ingham what is anticipated going out the the districts is the resolution, this explanation of proposed dfcs report as well as a disc with all of the background information. Also on the website all of the information will be made available to the general public. Bradley not a requirement but good practice because it tells people what has been done. Zimmer any issues with Appendix B – explanation of proposed DFC's. Chairman Zimmer called for a short recess to consider appendix B. 11:06 Chairman Zimmer called the meeting back to order at 11:15. Chairman wanting the group to approve this as something that can be used in the hearing process. Williams can it be adopted as a draft in case something that needs to get changed. Zimmer up to the group. Walthour at north plains they are link to the prpc site that will have all of this information posted to their websites. Zimmer this is to give the public

something they can read and understand. This can be built and revised by the time it gets to the final dfcs. Hardcastle moves to approve the draft explanation to the dfcs to be made available to the public. 2nd by Tate. Approved 4-0.

12. **Discuss and Consider** – Submission of Proposed Future Conditions and associated documentation for Major Aquifers in GMA#1

-Chairman Zimmer resolution is ready to go to TWDB for submission. Group agreed.

13. **Discuss and Consider** – Discussion & Scheduling of the Future Meetings of the GMA#1

-Zimmer asked if they wanted to allow Kyle and himself to get back with the group as things are progressed towards getting the necessary information posted and the public hearing process started.

14. **Adjournment**

-Walthour stated that on June 14th they are having a dedication of renaming their building Richard Bowers and are having a ceremony and everyone in the group should receive an invitation. Guthrie, stated that they are having an election in May, one board member is retiring. Their board is going to be changing in one way or another. Zimmer, election has been moved to November. It was a large hassle to have an election within the counties even with nothing else going on. Ingham, authorize the managers to get together in the interim to work on things as need for GMA1. Group agreed. Walthour kicked off master irrigator program have several people in the program. Hardcastle board meeting, some rules changes to be review. Mostly just to fit wording from the legislative requirements. Probably wont effect the management plan.